



# INSCRIPTIONS OF ASOKA

(INSCRIPTIONS OF ASOKA)

(PART II)

TRANSLATION, GLOSSARY & GENERAL INDEX

By

**BENI MADHAB BARUA,**

*Professor and Head of the Department of Pali, and Lecturer in the  
Department of Sanskrit and Ancient Indian History and Culture,  
University of Calcutta.*



080 C.U.  
003/3B

080 C.U.  
003/3B  
Pt. 2

PUBLISHED BY THE  
UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA  
1943

442



BCU 18

*Printed by*  
GOUR CHANDRA SEN, B.COM.  
THE SREE BHARATEE PRESS  
170, Maniktala Street, Calcutta.

155063



## PREFACE

When I undertook in 1940 to prepare a critical edition of the inscriptions of Aśoka for the benefit of students of the Post Graduate department of the University of Calcutta, making it up-to-date by the inclusion of all the inscriptions hitherto discovered, it was far from my intention to add this part containing the translation along with notes and general index. The work was to be completed just in one volume containing the Aśokan texts with a glossary at the end. The glossary was intended to be no more than a vocabulary of important words and phrases arranged in an alphabetical order. But after the text portion of the work had been set in type and the forms containing all but the rock edicts printed off, there was a pressing request from Dr. B. C. Law and some of my esteemed colleagues in the University not only to add translations with explanatory and critical notes but also to write a separate account of Aśoka and his inscriptions in the light of the new materials I was able to collect, embodying the results of my prolonged study of the subject.

Thus the work outgrew its original modest scheme with the result that it became difficult for me to justify the name Glossary applied to the notes which went in their amplitude far beyond the scope of a glossary as commonly understood. There having been references to 'Glossary' in several printed forms of the texts, I had no other alternative but to retain the name. This has, however, been justified by putting at the end an alphabetical table of words and phrases explained and discussed.

In offering the English translation of the inscriptions, my endeavour has all along been directed to producing an authentic rendering, keeping close to the original and maintaining as far as possible the 'turns of expressions' in the texts. How far I have succeeded in this attempt is for the reader to judge.

I have written a separate introductory work entitled 'Aśoka and His Inscriptions' for the better understanding and appreciation of the new suggestions offered and the new results obtained by me in the edition of the inscriptions.

In the Glossary I have tried to do justice to the interpretations and views of other scholars in the field. Whether I have accepted, discarded or modified their suggestions, I have taken care to state my reasons for doing so, labouring indeed throughout to follow Aśoka's method of *nijjhatti* as distinguished from that of *ujjhatti* or *argumentum ad veracundiam*.

I owe nevertheless an apology to the reader that in some instances I am likely to be found inconsistent as regards what I have said before and after. This is admittedly due to the fact that the manuscript of the entire work could not be sent to the press after it had undergone its final revision. On the other



hand, it has been written and printed off in several instalments. Happily such cases are few and far between. I should, therefore, draw the reader's attention to them so as to avoid all possible misgivings as to my being guilty of flagrant self-contradiction. I may be readily excused when I claim that the case is not really one of self-contradiction but that of self-growth in knowledge which proceeds from vagueness and indefiniteness to clearness and definiteness.

i. As to the note on Piyadasī, *seq.* p. 220 : The true significance of the full title of Aśoka, *Priyadasī lājā Māgadhe*, is that he was the "King of Magadha and Emperor of Jambudvīpa" (Aśoka and His Inscriptions, Ch. II). Prince Priyadarśana (Buddhaghosa's Piyadāsa) was anointed twice, first, as Aśoka, and subsequently, as Priyadarśin.

ii. As to notes on *vrachaspi* and *vinītasī*, *seq.* pp. 281, 283 : These are found to be Prakrit equivalents of the Sk. *rathavraje* and *vinīte* (*seq.*, p. 381), both together constituting a word corresponding to the Pali *rathavinīte*. This goes to strengthen the suggestion made on p. 316 as regards the official position of the *Vrachabhūmikas* : "Taking the *Vrachabhūmikas* to be the officers in charge of the places accessible to elephants, horses, and chariots, one may show that in M. R. E. (Ye) the elephant-riders and the chariot-trainers are included among the personal agents employed for circulating the king's message among the people."

iii. As to the note on *saṃghe upayāte*, *seq.*, p. 334 : The corresponding Pali expression, *saṃgham upayantu*, met with in the *Dīpavaṃsa*, vi. 68, in the sense of *gacchhantu saṃghadassanam*, corroborates the truth in the suggestion of M. Senart that *saṃgham upagamanam* 'refers to the state visit of the king to the Saṃgha.'

When the present work in a certain stage of its progress was shown to Dr. Syamaprasad Mookerjee, President of the Councils of Post-Graduate Teaching in Arts and Science, the first word of appreciation which he uttered was : "What kind of assistance can I render to see it published ?" And he was very pleased to hear that Dr. B. C. Law, M.A., B.L., Ph.D., D.Litt., F.R.A.S.B., who himself made a free gift to the University of the M.A. Pali Course compiled by him in two parts, had kindly promised to bear the entire cost of printing and paper.

I am much grateful indeed to Dr. Mookerjee for his encouragement and to Dr. Law for his generosity, which is usually unfailing where the advancement of learning is concerned.

Among my colleagues, the name of Mr. Sailendra Nath Mitra, M.A., now Secretary to the Councils of Post-Graduate Teaching in Arts and Science, deserves special mention. We read together the inscriptions of Aśoka and discussed various problems in connection therewith days after days and months after months and, as a matter of fact, he was to do the work which was ultimately entrusted to me. I have availed myself of his suggestive articles and notes on



( v )

Aśokan edicts and words published in the Journal of the Department of Letters, Calcutta University, the Indian Antiquary, the Indian Historical Quarterly, and the Indian Culture.

I am much indebted to my friend Mr. Satis Chandra Seal, M.A., B.L., Honorary General Secretary to the Indian Research Institute, for the arrangement he made with the Sree Bharatee Press to print the work at reduced rates of charge.

Partly on account of the dearth of paper in the market and partly to profit by the criticism of the scholars, the work has been printed only in a limited number of copies. When things return to their normal condition after the present world-wide war, a proper edition may be published, remedying the errors and removing the drawbacks in the present edition.

It should be noted that the Pali texts used, other than the Jātaka edited by Fausböll and those of the Siamese edition, are all published by the Pali Text Society. As for the Jaina Āchārāṅga Sūtra and Aupapātika Sūtra, the references in the following pages are to the texts edited by Walther Schubring and Ernst Leumann respectively. I have used the revised edition of Aśoka by Professor D. R. Bhandarkar, the third edition of Asoka by Vincent A. Smith, and the 4th edition of the Political History of Ancient India by Professor H. C. Raychaudhuri. The references to Hultzsch mean references to his edition and translation of the Inscriptions of Asoka in the Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, New series, Vol. I.

Dated, Calcutta,  
The 10th Oct., 1943.

B. M. BARUA



## ADDENDA

As to P.E. VI :—

1. *taṃ apahaṭṭā* : “not injuring, not violating it” (Kern), ‘not transgressing it’ (Hultzsck), *apahaṭṭā* being rightly equated with Sk. *apahṛitya*; ‘making that their own’ (Mookerji), equating *apahaṭṭā* with *apahṛitya*, *apahṛitvā*. The word *apahaṭṭā* is=Pali *a-pahaṭṭā*.

2. *apakathesu* : ‘in respect of those who are drawn away,’ as distinguished from *patiyāsamnesu* meaning ‘in respect of those who stand near,’ and *nātisu*, meaning ‘in respect of kinsmen, relatives.’ Mookerji comments thus on *apakathesu*, equating it with *apakṛishṭesu* : “Asoka serves all the peoples, relatives, the dear and near ones (specially mentioned in R.E. IV and VII), and others at a distance-from him” (Asoka, p. 185). Aśoka’s idiom *patiyāsamnesu apakathesu* corresponds to the Sk. *sannikṛishṭaḥ viprakṛishṭaḥ* (“near far,” Mādhava nidāna, Madhukosha-vyākhyā). In Sanskrit the word *apakṛishṭaḥ* or *aprakṛishṭaḥ* generally means ‘the low,’ ‘the inferior.’ This sense does not suit the Aśokan context. But it is also employed in the sense of ‘drawn away,’ e.g., *āśayāpakarshato yathā* (Mādhava-nidāna), *yadā vāyuh sthānāntarāt apakṛishya*. In accordance with this sense of the word, Aśoka’s *apakathesu* may be taken to mean ‘in respect of those whose relationship is far-fetched or forcibly made out.’ The actual bearing of the three words, *nātisu*, *patiyāsamnesu* and *apakathesu* may be ascertained in the light of Aśoka’s statement in his R.E. IX and XI : *Se vataviye pitinā pi putena pi bhātinā pi suvāmikena pi mitasamthutenā [pi] ava paṭivesiyena pi*. We may take it that here the *paṭivesiyas* (“neighbours”) stand for the *apakathas*, and the father, son, brother, etc., other than relatives, for the *patiyāsamnas*.

In Pali the word *vavakaṭṭha* (*vyapakṛishṭa*, Avadānaśataka, I, p. 231, II, p. 194), from the verb *apakassati*, *avakassati*, *vavakassati* (Sutta-nipāta, v. 281, Aṅguttara, v, p. 74, Vinaya, II, p. 204), means “drawn away.”

According to Bhandarkar (Aśoka, p. 351), the pronoun *taṃ* “refers to *hitasukha* which precedes it.” I cannot agree. Evidently it refers to the *dhammalipi* signifying as it does “the principles of piety enunciated in the Edicts.”

3. *nikāyesu* : The only point to discuss and settle is whether by this word Aśoka meant ‘the officers of all ranks’ or the *pāsāṃḍas* (“sects”). Bhandarkar takes it to denote the sects. But it would seem more probable that it refers to the officers, the sects being denoted by the word *pāsāṃḍā* in the context. For the employment of the word *nikāyā* in the sense of ‘bodies of officials’ as well as of ‘sects,’ see R.E. XII and R.E. XIII respectively.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Pages.</i>
TRANSLATION .. .. .	179-218
Fourteen Rock Edicts .. .. .	179-194
Two Separate Rock Edicts .. .. .	195-198
Minor Rock Edict .. .. .	199-202
Bhābru Edict .. .. .	203
Seven Pillar Edicts .. .. .	204-214
Schism Pillar Edict .. .. .	214-215
Queen's Edict .. .. .	216
Lumbini Pillar Inscription .. .. .	216
Nigāli Sāgar Pillar Inscription .. .. .	217
Three Barābar Hill-cave Inscriptions .. .. .	217
Miscellaneous Inscriptions .. .. .	218
GLOSSARY .. .. .	219-399
Glossary (proper) .. .. .	219-385
Addenda .. .. .	386-387
Alphabetical Table .. .. .	388-392
General Index .. .. .	393-399



## ERRATA & CORRIGENDA

Read '*happy here*' for '*happy*' (185, l. 20); '*possessed*' for '*possea*' (190, l. 19); '*and many*' for '*any many*' (190, l. 23); '*These and many*' for '*This and many*' (213, l. 6); '*Crowning stone-figures of infant elephants*' for '*The crowning stone-figure of a young elephant*' (216, l. 19)\*; '*Piyadāsa (Piyadassa, Priyadarśana)*' for '*Piyadāsa (Piyadassi)*' (221, l. 38); '*called*' for '*caled*' (233, l. 20); '*Tāmraparṇī*' for '*Tāmrapaṇī*' (236, l. 5); '*hardly*' for '*harly*' (236, l. 14); '*about the beginning*' for '*about beginning*' (236, l. 29); '*restoring*' for '*resoring*' (240, l. 10); '*derogatory*' for '*deregatory*' (255, l. 2); '*among the Udīchyas.*' for '*among the Udīchyas,*' (256, l. 36); omit '*the Aparānta division*' (256, l. 37); '*7*' for '*8*' (292, l. 1); '*8*' for '*9*' (297, l. 30); '*9*' for '*10*' (298, l. 39); '*sappuriso*' for '*sappariso*' (299, l. 5); '*Buddhaghosa in his*' for '*Buddhaghosa is his*' (302, l. 32); '*archeyam*' for '*arechayanī*' (304, l. 1); '*Kaṇāda's definition*' for '*Jaimini's definition*' (313, l. 2); '*Mānasaukasah*' for '*Mānasaukashah*' (356, l. 29); '*it would have been*' for '*it would have*' (377, l. 8).

\*Note that in the word *silāvigaḍa-bhīchā* (Lumbinī Pillar), *bhīchā* is a plural word. In the Chullavagga (Vinaya-P., II, p. 201), a *bhīṅka* (infant elephant) is distinguished from a *mahāvarāha* (big elephant). The plural word *bhīṅkā* is paraphrased by *taruṇakā bhīṅkachchhāpā*, and *mahāvarāhā* by *mahānāgā*. Here *bhīṅkā* is the same word as *bheṅgā* in the Bhūridatta-J. (seq., p. 259) with *bhīṅjā* as a variant (seq. 157), i.e., *bhekālā* (frogs), and not *bhīṅgālā* (bees), figuratively and in contradistinction to *varāhā* (boars), signify infant or young elephants. The above equation well accounts for the lengthening of *i* by the dropping of the nasal after it.

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Āṅguttara-N.=Anguttara-Nikāya.

Dīgha-N.=Dīgha-Nikāya.

I. A.=Indian Antiquary.

I. C.=Indian Culture.

I. H. Q.=Indian Historical Quarterly.

J.=Jātaka.

J. B. Br. A. S.=Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

J. B. O. R. S.=Journal of the Behar and Orissa Research Society.

Majjhima-N.=Majjhima-nikāya.

Saṃyutta-N.=Saṃyutta-Nikāya.



PART II  
TRANSLATION  
GLOSSARY  
GENERAL INDEX



## 1. FOURTEEN ROCK EDICTS

### I

#### [Girnār Text]

This Edict of the Law of Piety<sup>1</sup> is caused to be written<sup>2</sup> by King Priyadarśin,<sup>3</sup> Beloved of the gods.<sup>4</sup> Here<sup>5</sup> no sacrifice shall be<sup>6</sup> performed by immolating a living thing whatsoever,<sup>7</sup> and no festive gathering held<sup>8</sup>. King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods, sees many faults in (such) a gathering.<sup>9</sup> There are, however, certain festive gatherings approved of as good by King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods.<sup>10</sup> Formerly in the kitchen of King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods, many hundred thousands of animals<sup>11</sup> were daily killed for the purposes of curry.<sup>12</sup> But today when this edict is written,<sup>13</sup> only three animals are being (daily) killed for the purposes of curry—two peafowls<sup>14</sup> and one deer;<sup>15</sup> the deer, however, not invariably. Even these three creatures shall not be killed afterwards.<sup>16</sup>

1. Bühler and Mookerji, 'religious edict'; Hultzsch, 'moral script'.

2. 'Written' in the sense of 'drafted' or 'engraved'. See Glossary.

3, 4, 5. See Glossary.

6. The choice lies between 'shall be' and 'should be'. The first is to be preferred in so far as it concerns Aśoka himself, and the second as regards others.

7. Hultzsch's rendering, 'no living being must be killed and sacrificed', is apt to misinterpret Aśoka's intention. See Glossary.

8, 9, 10. See Glossary.

11. 'animals' in the sense of 'organised beings endowed with life, sensation, voluntary motion, etc. other than man, esp. quadrupeds.'

12. 'curry' in the sense of 'dish of meat etc. cooked with curry powder and usually served with rice'.

13. 'written' in the sense of 'promulgated'.

14. *i.e.*, edible birds typified by the peafowl.

15. *i.e.*, edible quadrupeds typified by the antelope.

16. See Glossary.



## II

## [Girnār Text]

Throughout the domain of King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods, so also in the bordering territories,<sup>1</sup> such as Choḍa,<sup>2</sup> Pāṇḍya,<sup>3</sup> Satiya-putra,<sup>4</sup> Ketalaputra,<sup>5</sup> as far (south) as Tāmraparṇī,<sup>6</sup> (that of) the Greek king named Antiochus, or even (those of other Greek) kings who are neighbours of the said Antiochus,<sup>7</sup>—everywhere King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods, has arranged for<sup>8</sup> two kinds of medical treatment, that for men and that for animals.<sup>9</sup> The medicinal herbs that are suitable for men and that for animals have been caused to be supplied and planted wheresoever these are not to be found. The medicinal roots and fruits, too, have been caused to be supplied and planted wheresoever these are not available. On the roads the wells (and the like) have been caused to be excavated,<sup>10</sup> and the shade-trees<sup>11</sup> planted for the enjoyment of men and animals.

## [Mansehra Text]

Throughout the domain of King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods, and (among) those<sup>12</sup> who are borderers<sup>13</sup>, such as the Cholas, the Pāṇḍyas, the Satiyaputras, the Keralaputras, the Tāmraparṇis, the

1. In the Girnār text the word *pachamtesu* keeps symmetry with *vijite* and signifies territories rather than peoples or rulers. See Glossary.

2. Literally, the land of the Choḍas. 3. Literally, the land of the Pāṇḍyas.

4. Generally taken to be the name of the ruler. But in M, the name is in the plural, *Satiyaputrā*. 5. Generally taken to be the name of the ruler. In M, the name occurs in a plural form, *Keralaputrā*.

6. Evidently the name of a separate territory. See Glossary.

7. The territories are represented by their rulers. 8. Literally, 'have been arranged for by King Priyadarśin'. 9. Here the word *pasu* mainly means the beasts of burden, useful beasts, cattle, horses and elephants.

10. The word 'sunk' would have been more idiomatic, but here the wells typify all artificial sources of water-supply.

11. The shade-trees typified by the banyan (P.E. VII).

12. i.e., in the territories of.

13. Bhandarkar has coined the word 'frontagers' for translating *amṭā*,



Greek king called Antiochus, and those other (Greek) kings who are the neighbours of the said Antiochus,—everywhere King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods, has arranged for two kinds of medical treatment, . . . . . (all as in Gīrnār text). Likewise the medicinal roots and fruits have been caused to be supplied and planted wheresoever these are not available. . . . . (all as in Gīrnār text).

### III

[ Kalsi Text ]

Thus saith<sup>1</sup> King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods: This has been commanded by me anointed twelve years:—Throughout my domain the *Yuktas*, the *Rajjuka* (and) the *Prādeśika*<sup>2</sup> shall every five years go forth on official tours of inspection for that purpose,<sup>3</sup> for imparting this instruction in the Law of Piety,<sup>4</sup> just as well for doing other (administrative) duties<sup>5</sup>: Respectful attention<sup>6</sup> to mother and father is good, good is liberality to friends, associates and relatives, and the religionists, the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Śramaṇas*,<sup>7</sup> good is the non-killing of living beings, moderate spending, moderate possessing<sup>8</sup> is good. And the *Parishad* (Purushas?)<sup>9</sup> shall instruct the *Yuktas* (in the Secretariat) in the matter of formulating the message<sup>10</sup> in the letter and spirit thereof.<sup>11</sup>

1. Literally, 'Thus said'.

2. According to the Dhauḷi and Jaugaḍā texts, 'the *Yuktas*, the *Rajjuka* and the *Prādeśika*'. The Gīrnār text compels one to translate: 'The *Yuktas* and the *Rajjuka* and the *Prādeśika* shall go forth'. See Glossary. Acc. to S. N. Mitra, the *Rajjukas* and the *Prādeśikas* were two main divisions of the *Yuktas*.

3. According to the Gīrnār text, 'for that very purpose'. See Glossary.

4. 'Piety' in the sense of 'the quality of being pious: reverence for the teachers of religion and desire to do what they teach; love and duty towards parents, etc; dutiful conduct.' Thus with Vincent A. Smith one may think that Aśoka's *Dhamma* connotes both the Law of Piety and the Law of Duty.

5. See S.R.E.I. 6. This is to be preferred to 'obedience' and 'hearkening'.

7. See Glossary. 8. Literally, 'little expenditure, little accumulation.'

9. See Glossary.

10. The word *gananaśi* or *gananaśyaṇi* (G) is taken by Jayaswal to mean the Accounts or Finance Department, which is far from the case. See Glossary.

11. Literally, 'from the point of view of reason and language.'

\* The concluding sentence is to be treated as introductory to R.E. IV, which follows as a corollary to R. E. III. See Glossary.



## IV

## [ Gīrnār Text ]

In ages gone by, during many hundred years, there had increased indeed the slaughter of life, the harming attitude of mind towards living beings, unseemly behaviour to relatives,<sup>1</sup> unseemly behaviour to the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Śramaṇas*. But today by the practice of piety on the part of King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods, the sound of the drum has become the sound of the doctrine<sup>2</sup> : such as could not be (increased) in the past, during many hundred years, by exhibiting to the people the sight of (celestial) mansions,<sup>3</sup> the sight of (celestial) elephants,<sup>4</sup> and host of fiery<sup>5</sup> and similar other celestial forms,<sup>6</sup> has been increased today by the imparting of instructions in the Law of Piety by King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods, (as regards) the non-slaughter of life, the non-harming attitude of mind towards living beings, seemly behaviour to relatives, seemly behaviour to the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Śramaṇas*, respectful attention to mother and father, respectful attention to elders.<sup>7</sup> This and various other practices of piety have been increased,<sup>8</sup> and King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods, will increase this practice of piety. And the sons, grandsons, and great-grandsons of King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods, will be greatly increasing this very practice of piety until the commencement of the period of envelopment of the cosmos.<sup>9</sup> Standing firm in piety and virtue, they will be inculcating the norm of conduct. This verily is the supreme duty, namely, the inculcation of the norm of conduct. The practice of piety, however, is not possible for a person devoid of virtue. Accordingly an increase in this matter and not

1. The word implies also friends, associates, and comrades.

2. Treating *aho* as an interjection, Dr. S. K. Aiyangar translates : "But now, in consequence of the adoption of the *Dharma* (the law of morality) by Devānam-priya Priyadarśin the sound of the drum is lo ! but the sound of the *Dharma*." See Glossary.

3. Same as celestial cars. See Glossary.

4. 5. 6. See Glossary.

7. The word implies not only those seniors by age and wisdom but those who are teachers and preceptors as well.

8. Or, "promoted."

9. See Glossary.



a decrease is good. For that purpose this is caused to be written, that they will apply themselves to effecting its increase,<sup>1</sup> and that its decrease<sup>2</sup> shall not be preferred.<sup>3</sup> This is caused to be written<sup>4</sup> by King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods, anointed twelve years.

1. Or, "promotion," "growth."

2. Or, "deterioration," "decay."

3. According to other texts, "and that they would not prefer its decrease."

4. According to Sh and Dh texts, "written here," referring to the place where the edict was engraved.

## V

### [Shahbazgarhi Text]

Thus saith King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods : Doing a good deed is difficult. He who does it first, does a difficult thing (indeed). But many a good deed has been done by me. He who among my sons and grandsons and those who will pass as my descendants after them until the termination of the present world system will abide by it, will thereby do an act of merit, but he who will abandon even a part hereof, will do an act of demerit. It is easy indeed to commit sin.<sup>1</sup> Formerly, in the ages gone by, there were, of course, no functionaries called *Dharmamahāmātras*.<sup>2</sup> They, however, have been appointed by me anointed thirteen years. They are occupied with all denominations for the establishment of the Law of Piety and for effecting an increase in conformation to the norm of conduct, as well as for the good and happiness of the virtuous. They are occupied for the unfettering<sup>3</sup> of the virtuous among<sup>4</sup> the Yaunas, the Kāmbojas, the Gāndhāras, the Rāshṭrikas and hereditary Rāshṭrikas, or even those

1. According to Ye, K, Dh and J, "It is easy to step into the house of sin"; and according to M, "Sin is a well-boarded (ship)."

2. See Glossary.

3. i.e., unrestricted movement.

4. According to G, *dharmamayutānaṁ aparigodhāya* is to be connected with *Yona-Kāmboja-Gāndhārānaṁ*, etc., and *hitasukhāya* with *bhatamayesu*, etc. According to Ye, K, Dh and J, one has to treat *dharmamayutāye* as an adjective to *apalibodhāye*, and to translate : "for the good and happiness (and) for the lawful freedom of movement."



who are other western peoples,<sup>1</sup> (and) for the good and happiness<sup>2</sup> of those who live on wages,<sup>3</sup> Brahmins and ascetics (who live by begging),<sup>4</sup> the destitute<sup>5</sup> and the aged. They are occupied for providing a person kept in prison with ransom,<sup>6</sup> for his unfettering,<sup>7</sup> and for his release,<sup>8</sup> particularly if he has a (large) family to maintain, or has acquired the right by good conduct,<sup>9</sup> or is grown very old. Here<sup>10</sup> and in outer towns, in all (my)<sup>11</sup> households<sup>12</sup> and (those) of my brothers and sisters, or even (those) of other kith and kin,—everywhere they are occupied. Whether one<sup>13</sup> inclines to piety, or is established in the Law of Piety, or is given to charity,—the said *Dharmamahāmātras* are occupied everywhere in my domain working for piety.<sup>14</sup> For this<sup>15</sup> purpose this Edict of the Law of Piety is written, that it shall be long-enduring and that my progeny shall act accordingly.

1. See Glossary.

2. According to Ye, K, Dh and J, the phrase *hitasukhāye* applies alike to the *Aparāntas*.

3. Hultsch, "servants and masters"; Mookerji, "the soldiers and their chiefs"; Bhandarkar, "who have become hirelings."

4. Or simply, "Brahmin householders." Generally rendered: "the *Brāhmaṇas* and householders." See Glossary.

5. The word signifies all who are poor and destitute. See Glossary.

6. Hultsch, "supporting the prisoners (with money)."

7. 8. I accept Bhandarkar's rendering. Hultsch, "releasing (them) from the fetters (of worldly life)", which is going too far beyond the text.

9. Hultsch, "those who are bewitched (i.e., incurably ill)"; Bhandarkar, "is subjected to oppression"; Mookerji, "overwhelmed with misfortune." See Glossary.

10. According to G, "In Pāṭaliputra."

11. See Dh and J.

12. Literally 'harems', 'closed female apartments.'

13. Literally "he."

14. Bhandarkar, "Everywhere in my dominions they are occupied with those devoted to *Dhamma* according as there is anyone who is leaning on *Dhamma*, is an abode of *Dhamma*, or is given to almsgiving."

15. Literally "that"; 'this' acc. to Dh.



Thus saith King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods : Formerly, in the ages gone by, there was no transaction of (state) business or reporting<sup>1</sup> at all hours. But thus have I ordained (the thing): at all times, while I am taking my meal, am in the (inner circle of) the household,<sup>2</sup> in the bed-chamber, in the promenade,<sup>3</sup> or in the carriage<sup>4</sup> and the pleasanee,<sup>5</sup>—everywhere the Reporters are stationed so that they may report to me the people's business. And everywhere<sup>6</sup> I transact<sup>7</sup> the people's business. And whatever orders I myself verbally give to the *Dāpaka*<sup>6</sup> (concerning something to be given) or to the *Śrāvāpaka*<sup>7</sup> (concerning something to be proclaimed), or what again is entrusted to the *Mahāmātras* as an urgent matter, if in that connection any difference or agreement<sup>8</sup> exists in the Council of Ministers, that is to be reported immediately to me in all places, at all times. Thus it is commanded by me : I have no satiety in exertion or dispatch of business. Doing good to the whole world is considered (the main) duty indeed by me. And again at the root of this is exertion and dispatch of business. There is verily no greater duty than doing good to the whole world. And whatever I strive for, it is intended that I shall acquit myself of the debt to the living beings and that I shall make them happy and let them attain heaven hereafter. It is for this purpose that this Edict of the Law of Piety is caused to be written, that it will endure for ever, and that my sons and grandsons and great-grandsons shall act accordingly towards doing good to the whole world. But this is difficult to achieve except by the best kind of endeavour.

1. i.e., receiving of petition.

2. See Glossary.

3. See Glossary.

4. The word signifies all royal conveyances.

5. See Glossary.

6. The same as to say, "at all times." Aśoka's statement is a good corroboration of Alexander's philosophy : "There is no Space without Time, nor Time without Space."

6, 7. See Glossary.

8. Or, 'decision.'

9. Literally, 'satisfaction.'



## VII

[Girnār Text]

King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods, wishes that all sects should dwell everywhere.<sup>1</sup> He wishes them all self-control and purity of sentiment.<sup>2</sup> But the people<sup>3</sup> are of diverse inclinations<sup>4</sup> and of diverse passions.<sup>5</sup> They will do it all or will do only a part of it. Even in spite of large charity, he who has no self-control, or purity of sentiment, or gratitude,<sup>6</sup> or firm devotion, is exceedingly low.

1. *i.e.*, everywhere in his dominions, throughout his domain.

2. The word *bhāvasudhitā* implies also 'the purity of intellect,' 'the magnanimity of heart,' 'the charitable disposition.' See Glossary.

3. By 'people' are meant persons belonging to various religious denominations.

4. Here 'impulses,' or 'desires' also suits the context.

5. Here one may substitute 'likings' or 'emotions.' According to Ye, 'of diverse notions of welfare.'

6. The verse conveying the moral of the Javasakupa-Jātaka distinguishes between these three phases of ingratitude: (1) the non-acknowledgement of service rendered by the benefactor, (2) not doing anything in return of service, and (3) doing harm to the benefactor.

## VIII

[Girnār Text]

In the ages gone by, the kings went forth on pleasure-trips. Here were hunting and such other diversions. The said King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods, when he had been anointed ten years, proceeded to Sambodhi.<sup>1</sup> Thereby it turned out to be a pilgrimage of piety. Here it consists in visiting the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Śramaṇas* and making gifts to them, visiting also elderly persons and making provisions of money for them, meeting the people of countrysides and those of towns,<sup>2</sup> inculcating the Law of Piety and discussing the subject. From that undertaking<sup>3</sup> arises greater delight of this kind. The other<sup>4</sup> is the portion of King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods.

1. *i.e.*, the holy spot of the Bo-tree.

2. Not necessarily the *jānapadas* and *janas* as organized bodies.

3. *i.e.*, from the pilgrimage of piety.

4. *i.e.*, the greater delight springing up from a pilgrimage of piety.



## IX

[Girnār Text]

Thus saith King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods : There are people who perform various<sup>1</sup> auspicious rites<sup>2</sup> in times of illness, or on occasions of marriage of sons and of daughters, or on those of birth of sons,<sup>3</sup> or in setting out on a journey to a distant place,—on this and on (similar)<sup>4</sup> other occasions the people perform various auspicious rites. Here particularly the womenfolk perform many and diverse, minor and meaningless rites. The auspicious rites should, of course, be performed.<sup>5</sup> Such a rite, however, produces small fruit. That certainly is the large-fruit-bearing rite which is the rite of piety. As to that, it inculcates : Seemly behaviour to slaves and servants (and) honouring of superiors<sup>6</sup> with submissiveness<sup>7</sup> are good, restraint in treating living beings is good, good is liberality to the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Śramaṇas*. These and such other (practices)<sup>8</sup> are called the rite of piety. This should then be pronounced by a father, or by a son, or by a brother, or by a master :<sup>9</sup> “This form of rite is good, this should be done until the accomplishment of the (desired) object.” And even it is said : “Good is the offering of a gift.”<sup>10</sup> But there is no such gift or favour as the gift of the doctrine or favour by way of the doctrine. This should verily be inculcated by a friend, or by a comrade, or by a relative, or by a companion in this or that connexion : “This is the thing to be done, this is good, by this let one attain one’s heaven<sup>11</sup> and what can be a greater duty than this, namely, the attainment of heaven ?”

1. Literally, ‘high and low.’

2. *i.e.*, customary ceremonies or popular usages prescribed or sanctioned by secular Brahmanism.

3. According to other texts, ‘for begetting a son,’ ‘for the birth of a son,’ here the son implying also a daughter.

4. Justified by other texts.

5. The affirmative statement may be construed also as a subjunctive clause and translated : “If the auspicious rite is to be performed, (it should be noted that) such a rite produces small fruit.”

6. The word signifies ‘parents,’ ‘teachers’ and ‘preceptors.’

7. As Buddhaghosa defines, *apachiti* is *nīchavuttitāya pūjanā*.

8. The expressions in the text are in the singular.

9. May be translated “by a husband.”

10. This is a quotation from a then known Buddhist text.

11. Cp. M.R.E. (J): *svakaṃ (tena) sakaṃ vip[u]laṃ [ārādhe]taviye*, “one’s own grand heaven must be attained thereby.”





## [Shahbazgarhi Text]

(All as in Gīrnār Text). This should then be pronounced even by a father or a son or a brother or a master or a friend and associate, nay, even by a neighbour: "This form of rite is good, this should be done until the attainment of his object; even after the object is attained I will practise it again. That which is this very rite<sup>1</sup> lies open to doubt—that his object may turn out to have its fulfilment, but that may not again be of any effect in this world."<sup>2</sup> This rite of piety is not, however, restricted to time. Even if his object does not turn out to have its fulfilment here, in effect hereafter it produces unbounded merit. If, on the other hand, the object turns out to have its fulfilment (also) here, then both (the interests) become well secured—he (attains) the object here and produces unbounded merit hereafter by the rite of piety.

1. According to Ye, and M, 'the second rite,' referring, as I take it, to the *dhammamamgala*.

2. As Hultsch construes the sentence, maybe rightly, "For such ceremonies are of doubtful effect. One may attain his object (by them), But he may not (do so). And they (bear fruit) in this world only." As I construe it, doubt arises as to whether the rite of piety can serve one's interests in this very world, the general belief being that a religious practice is good only for furthering one's otherworldly interests. See Glossary.

## X

## [Gīrnār Text]

King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods, considers no name or fame<sup>1</sup> as of great significance other than that in the present time and in the long time (to come)<sup>2</sup> the people will on my account attend to the service of piety and act in accordance with the Law of Piety.<sup>3</sup> For this purpose King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods, wishes for name

1. Literally, 'fame and glory.'

2. Justified by other texts.

3. Ye has *dhammayutam* instead of *dhammavutam*, equated with *dhammaktam* or *dhammavuttam*.

\* K and four remaining texts have made the statement rather cumbrous with the insertion of the clause *yam pi yaso vā kīṭi vā ichhati*,



or fame. And what little King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods, exerts himself,<sup>4</sup> all that is for the hereafter, and in order that all may be free from the innate proneness to immorality. That indeed is the innate proneness to immorality which is sin.<sup>5</sup> This, however, is difficult for men<sup>6</sup> of lesser or of exalted<sup>7</sup> position to achieve<sup>8</sup> except by the very best kind of exertion, forsaking everything (else). This certainly is even (more)<sup>9</sup> difficult of achievement by a person of exalted position.

4. Mookerji's rendering is adopted.

5. Literally, 'demerit.'

6. Ye, K, Sh and K read *vagena* or *vagrena* instead of *janena*. Dh and J omit the word altogether.

7. Better, 'lower' and 'higher.'

8. Literally, 'difficult of achievement by.'

9. Justified by Dh and J.

## XI

### [Girnār Text]

Thus saith King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods. There is no such gift [or association or distribution or connection] as the gift of the doctrine or the association with the doctrine or the distribution of the doctrine or the connection with the doctrine. As to that, it follows—good is seemly behaviour to slaves and servants (and also) respectful attention to mother and father, good is liberality to friends, associates and relatives (and) to the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Śramaṇas*, non-slaughter of life<sup>1</sup> is good. This should be pronounced by a father or a son or a brother or a friend, associate or relative, or even by neighbours—"This is good, this should be done. In so doing, this world is secured and hereafter unbounded merit accrues<sup>2</sup> by that gift of doctrine."<sup>3</sup>

1. Literally, "non-killing of living beings."

2. According to other texts, "begets, produces."

3. Here the expression "gift of doctrine" implies also "association with doctrine, distribution of doctrine and connection with doctrine."



## XII

[Kalsi Text]

King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods, honours all sects of recluses<sup>1</sup> or householders<sup>2</sup> with gifts and by various modes of honouring. But the Beloved of the gods does not mind either the offering of gifts or honouring so much as that there should be growth of all sects in the essence of things. The growth in the essence of things is, of course, of various kinds. The root of it, however, is this, namely, the control of speech, intending that there may be no honouring<sup>3</sup> of one's own sect or condemnation<sup>4</sup> of other sects without point,<sup>5</sup> or that condemnation on this or that point may be light, or even that other sects should be honoured in this or that form.<sup>6</sup> In so doing, one greatly increases (the fame of) one's own sect, and also<sup>7</sup> renders service to other sects. In acting otherwise, one digs the grave for one's own sect, and also<sup>8</sup> does harm to other sects. Whosoever honours one's own sect or condemns other sects, (does so) all due indeed to devotion to one's own sect, intending, "I will glorify my own sect." But again in acting thus, by far the more they injure their own sect. (So)<sup>9</sup> concord<sup>10</sup> is good, intending that they will hear<sup>11</sup> one another's<sup>12</sup> doctrine. Such indeed is the wish of the Beloved of the gods that all sects may be well-informed<sup>13</sup> and possessed of a good tradition.<sup>14</sup> And those who are sincere believers in this or that sect should be told: "The Beloved of the gods does not mind either offering of gifts or honouring so much as that there should be growth of all sects in the essence of things." Any many are occupied for that purpose, the *Dharmamahāmātras*, the Superintendents of women<sup>15</sup> the 'Vrachabhūmikas,'<sup>16</sup> or<sup>17</sup> other classes of officials. And this is the result of that, namely, an increase in the fame of one's own sect as well as glorification of the doctrine.

1. Here the word means all those who have renounced the world for the sake of religion.

2. According to G, all sects and recluses and householders, which is meaningless. 3. i.e., praise or praising. 4. i.e., criticism or blaming.

5. i.e., irrelevantly. 6. According to G, in this or that connection.

7, 8. Literally, 'or even.' 9. Justified by other texts.

10. According to Sh, 'restraint,' 'self-control.'

11. "hear" in the sense of 'learn.' 12. Or, 'each other's.'

13. i.e., 'profound in knowledge.' 14. The tradition of knowledge or of good action.

15. See Glossary. 16. i.e., the officers in charge of promenades, pavilions, places of amusement, and the like. See Glossary.

17. According to other texts, 'and.'



## XIII

[ Kalsi Text ]

Kaliṅga<sup>1</sup> was conquered by King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods, anointed eight years. One hundred thousand and a half in number were the men carried away<sup>2</sup> thence (as captives), one hundred thousand in number were killed in action<sup>2a</sup>, (and) as many as that<sup>3</sup> died. Thereafter, in connection with the recently annexed country of the Kaliṅgas,<sup>4</sup> (arose) a strong pious tendency,<sup>5</sup> a longing for piety, (and) an (idea of) inculcating the Law of Piety in<sup>6</sup> the Beloved of the gods. The Beloved of the gods has this repentance on account of having conquered the country of the Kaliṅgas. In conquering indeed an unconquered country, the slaying or dying<sup>7</sup> or deporting which occurs there<sup>8</sup> is considered an extremely painful and serious<sup>9</sup> matter by the Beloved of the gods. Even more serious than that is this, that those who dwell there, the *Brāhmaṇas* or the *Śramaṇas* or others—the sects of householders,<sup>10</sup> in whom are established this respectful attention to high personages,<sup>11</sup> respectful attention to mother and father, respectful attention to seniors,<sup>12</sup> seemly behaviour<sup>13</sup> and firm devotion to friends, associates, companions and relatives, to slaves and servants, there is hurt or death or deportation to their adherents;

1. Literally, "The Kaliṅgas," meaning Kaliṅga or the country of the Kaliṅgas. 2. Hultzsch, "deported." 2a. 'wounded,' acc. to G.

3. Hultzsch and others, "many times as many." According to my rendering, the number suggested is precisely the same as the preceding one, i.e., one hundred thousand.

4. Aśoka did not certainly mean to say: "in the recently annexed country of the Kaliṅgas." In plain words, "after the recent annexation of Kaliṅga."

5. Corresponding to Aśoka's *dharmaṃavāye*, we have in Bengali *dharmer vāi* or *dharmer vātik*, which means 'mania for religion.' According to Sh, *dhramasilana*, "cultivation of piety."

6. Literally, "of."

7. Literally, "death."

8. Same as to say, "then."

9. Hultzsch, "deplorable."

10. Hultzsch and others, "The *Brāhmaṇas* or *Śramaṇas*, or other sects or householders." The intended distinction is really between the *pravrajita* and *grihastha pāṣaṇḍas*, the former being represented by the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Śramaṇas*. See Glossary.

11. Hultzsch, "those who receive high pay."

12. Hultzsch, "elders."

13. Hultzsch, "proper courtesy."



or that even (as regards) those well-established ones<sup>14</sup> whose affection has not diminished, if those who are their friends, associates, comrades and relatives encounter disaster, on that account<sup>15</sup> that,<sup>16</sup> too, becomes a cause of hurt right to them. This is a common reaction<sup>17</sup> to all men and a serious matter in the opinion of the Beloved of the gods. And there is no locality other than that of the Yaunas where these distinct bodies of the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Śramaṇas* are not, and there is also no locality where the people have not, in at least one of them, what is called sincere faith. Now, as many men were then killed and died and were carried away as captives, a hundredth or thousandth part thereof is considered today a serious matter by the Beloved of the gods. Even he who today<sup>18</sup> does mischief is considered pardonable by the Beloved of the gods, whom he can pardon. And also the forest-folk<sup>19</sup> who happen to be in the domain of the Beloved of the gods, even them he entreats and persuades to think; the remorse as well as power of the Beloved of the gods ought to be explained to them so that they will be ashamed of their conduct and will not get killed. Verily the Beloved of the gods wishes all living beings non-injury, self-control, practice of serenity (and) mildness. This, of course, is considered the chief conquest by the Beloved of the gods, namely, the conquest by piety. That however,<sup>20</sup> has been achieved by the Beloved of the gods here<sup>21</sup> as well as among all the borderers, even over a distance of six hundred leagues, (where the rulers are) the Greek king named Antiochus, and four (other Greek) kings beyond the said Antiochus, namely, Ptolemy, Antigonas, Magas (and) Alexander, (and) constantly<sup>22</sup> (the ruling peoples are) the Choḍas and Pāṇḍyas, even the Tāmraparṇikas. So also here, in the king's territory,<sup>23</sup> among the Yaunas and Kāmbojas, the Nābhakas and Nābhapaṃktis,<sup>24</sup> the Bhojas and hereditary Bhojas,<sup>25</sup> the Andhras and Pāra-

14. Hultzsch and others, those who "are well provided for."

15. It means, because of the fact that their affection for their people has not diminished.

16. It means, the trouble undergone by their people.

17. Bhandarkar, "the common lot," which well suits the context.

18. According to Sh, *Yo pi cha*, "and he who."

19. Meaning 'those who live or hide themselves in forests.' See Glossary.

20. According to other texts, "again."

21. i.e., "in the king's territory."

22. *nicham*=*nityam*, not *nīcham*, cf. *niche* (R.E. VII, D, J).

23. According to Mr. Charan Das Chatterjee, the term *rājavisaya* is used here in its narrow technical sense, which is apparently far from the case. See Glossary.

24. 25. See Glossary.



das,<sup>26</sup>—everywhere (the people) follow the moral instruction<sup>27</sup> of the Beloved of the gods. Even where the envoys of the Beloved of the gods do not go, even (there) they hearing of the system of piety<sup>28</sup> and moral instruction of the Beloved of the gods, will abide by, will abide by<sup>29</sup> the Law of Piety. The conquest which is achieved everywhere by this means<sup>29a</sup>, that conquest functions in all manner<sup>30</sup> for joy.<sup>31</sup> That emotion of joy is attained through the conquest by piety. But verily that kind of joy is slight ; the Beloved of the gods considers as of great bearing that which pertains to the world beyond. And for this purpose this Edict of the Law of Piety is written in order that (whosoever) may be (my)<sup>32</sup> sons (and) grandsons will not think of a new conquest as worth achieving ; in a conquest which is possible indeed by the force of arms,<sup>33</sup> let them like to practise forbearance<sup>34</sup> and light punishment, and think of that conquest only which is the conquest by piety. That is good for this world and the world beyond. Let that delight<sup>35</sup> be worthy of mention<sup>36</sup> which is the delight in piety. That certainly is good for this world and the world beyond.

26. According to G and Sh, *Pārindas* or *Pālindas*. See Glossary.

27. i.e., the Law of Piety as inculcated by Aśoka.

28. Here *dhammavutam vidhānam* = *dhammayutam vidhānam*.

29. According to other texts, "abide by and will abide by," which yields a better sense.

29a. So the text reads in the original.

30. According to Sh, "everywhere."

31. Literally, "has the flavour of joy." But *rasa* as a Buddhist technical term means 'a function' or "a functional quality."

32. Justified by other texts.

33. Literally, "by means of the bow", and according to G, "by means of the arrow."

34. The term *khanti*, as distinguished from *titikkhā*, means a moral quality of calmly or gladly enduring the pain caused by the oppressor.

35. Hultzsch, "all (their) pleasure."

36. According to K, "delight in exertion."





## XIV

• [Kalsi Text]

This Edict of the Law of Piety<sup>1</sup> is caused to be written by King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods, (to say)—(There) is indeed (a text presented) in a concise form, (there) is (one) in a medium form, (there) is (one) in an elaborate form. Verily<sup>2</sup> all have not been possible<sup>3</sup> everywhere. Vast is indeed the domain. Many have been written and I will certainly cause a host to be written.<sup>4</sup> And here is (a certain thing) said over and over again on account of the sweetness of meaning of this or that, whereby<sup>5</sup> the people may proceed accordingly. Here<sup>6</sup> may be something written incompletely, either in view of<sup>7</sup> (the unsuitability of) the place,<sup>8</sup> or in consideration of<sup>9</sup> (other) reasons,<sup>10</sup> or due to the fault of the scribe.<sup>11</sup>

---

1. Apparently the reference is to this particular edict, while the statement applies to the whole set or series of the Fourteen Rock Edicts.

2. According to G, "And".

3. Hultzsch, "suitable."

4. According to G and Sh, "Many have been written and I will certainly cause (many) to be written."

5. According to G, "intending that," "in order that."

6. According to G, "there".

7. Literally, "knowing."

8. See Glossary.

9. Literally, "considering."

10. See Glossary.

11. i.e., "the engraver."



## 2. TWO SEPARATE ROCK EDICTS

### I

#### [Dhauli Text]

By the word (of command) of the Beloved of the gods, the *Mahā-mātras* (who are) City-judiciaries at Tosali<sup>1</sup> are to be told : Whatsoever I perceive (as good),<sup>2</sup> that I wish, intending—"I would fulfil (it) by action<sup>3</sup> and achieve by (some definite)<sup>4</sup> means." And this is considered by me to be the chief means, (namely), that which in this matter is the instruction to you. You are verily placed over many thousands of beings,<sup>5</sup> (desiring)—we will for a certainty gain the affection of men. (To me) all men<sup>6</sup> are (like) my progeny.<sup>7</sup> Just as I wish in the case of the progeny that they<sup>8</sup> should be connected with all good and happiness pertaining to this world and to the world beyond, so also I wish in the case of all men. And you do not get as far as this matter goes ; some one gets indeed at this, (but) he, too, does a part, not the whole of it. You better see to this : Although well-established, to be sure, is this maxim of conduct,<sup>9</sup> (there) is even a single man who suffers either arrest or torture. There occurs on that account a sudden culmination in imprisonment,<sup>10</sup> and others, the

1. See Glossary. 2. Hultzsch, "recognize (to be right)."

3. Hultzsch, "carry out by deeds". 4. Hultzsch, "various".

5. i.e., "human beings", "men".

6. i.e., "subjects".

7. Hultzsch, "All men are my children".

8. According to text, "he".

9. Hultzsch, "in the administration (of justice)", a locative construction of *nītiyaṃ*, which is far from correct. Lüders rightly takes *nīti* in the sense of *daṇḍanīti* ; *suvihitā pi nītiyaṃ* may be treated as a clause like "In spite of this being a well-established rule of conduct."

10. Hultzsch. In this case (an order) cancelling the imprisonment is (obtained) by him accidentally ; Bhandarkar, "There it causelessly develops thereby into imprisonment or death"; Mookerji, "Which accidentally becomes the cause of his death". All have missed the real sense of the word *bandhanam-tikaṃ*,



blood-relations<sup>1</sup> (and) many people distantly related<sup>2</sup> feel grieved<sup>3</sup> Therein you are to desire, intending, "We will fulfil the Mean<sup>4</sup>." By these propensities,<sup>5</sup> however, it does not succeed : by malignity,<sup>6</sup> by irascibility,<sup>7</sup> by cruelty, by oppressiveness,<sup>8</sup> by non-application,<sup>9</sup> by indolence, by weariness (for exertion). This is to be desired, intending, "These propensities may not be mine."<sup>10</sup> At the root of all these are non-irascibility and non-oppressiveness. This is the maxim of conduct—Those who are weary of exertion, they, after getting up, are not fit to move about, or for the matter of that, to walk or proceed.<sup>11</sup> He of you who sees the thing in this very way, by him should be told : "Keep in view the acquitting yourselves of the debt<sup>12</sup>—such and such is the instruction of the Beloved of the gods ; that which is a fulfilment of this is of great bearing, the non-fulfilment is of terrible consequence. Verily, badly given effect to this, there is neither the attainment of heaven nor that of royal favour. It is difficult indeed to procure the equal of this work,<sup>13</sup> what to think of anything in excess?<sup>14</sup> But rightly giving effect to this, you will attain heaven and you will (also) get yourselves free from the debt to me. And this writ is to be heard under the Tishyā asterism,<sup>15</sup> and even at the interval between the

1, 2, 3. Hultsch, "While (many) other people continue to suffer"; Bhandarkar, "Many other people more distant also suffer"; Mookerji, "And many other persons are deeply aggrieved over it." All have mined the distinction between *vage* and *bahujane daviye*.

4. Pali *majjha*, Sk. *Madhya*.

5. i.e., "immoral dispositions".

6. This is preferred to "envy" or "jealousy".

7. According to Buddhaghosa, the word is *asuropa* and it means "a state of anger when the words of a person are not well-put"; according to others, "that which brings tears to the eyes of other people." The Pali word must be *assuropa*, otherwise the Aśokan form *āsulopa* remains phonetically unaccounted for.

8. Or, "precipitancy".

9. Bhandarkar, "want of application."

10. This refers to the officials concerned, and not to Aśoka.

11. Hultsch, "He who is fatigued in the administration (of justice), will not rise ; but one ought to move, to walk, and to advance"; Bhandarkar, "He who is wearied, will not rise. But one ought to move, proceed and advance."

12. i.e., "obligation to the king."

13, 14. i.e., "not to speak of anything in excess." Bhandarkar, "because zealousness of mind in this my work has a twofold consequence"; Mookerji, "The reason why (there is) my excessive thought (is) that of this duty (there is) a twofold gain."

15. See Glossary.



Tishya days (it is) to be heard at opportune moments,<sup>16</sup> even by a single person. And acting thus, you are able to fulfil (it). For this purpose this writ is written here, whereby the City-judiciaries may work<sup>17</sup> eternally, whereby there may not be either sudden restriction of freedom or sudden state of torture.<sup>18</sup> And for this purpose I myself shall send forth on tours of inspection every five years the *Mahāmātras* who will be (found) not harsh, not furious, (and) possessed of winsome cordiality, (intending), they knowing (and) being aware of this matter (will) act as my instruction is. Even from Ujjayinī<sup>19</sup> the Kumāra Viceroy<sup>20</sup> shall for that very purpose send forth officials of the selfsame rank, and shall not exceed three years. Even so from Takṣhaśilā.<sup>21</sup> Whenever these *Mahāmātras* will go forth on tours of inspection, then without abandoning their own duties,<sup>22</sup> they shall know even this, (and will) also execute this as the king's instruction is.

16. i.e., "on suitable occasions," "according to opportunities," "frequently."

17. Or, "fettering."

18. Or, "harsh treatment."

19. See Glossary.

20, 21. See Glossary.

22. Meaning "usual official duties."

### [ Jaugaḍā Text ]

Thus saith the Beloved of the gods :—The *Mahāmātras* (who are) the City-judiciaries at Samāpā<sup>1</sup> are thus to be told : (all practically as in the Dhauli Text). Although well-established is (this rule of conduct), (there) is many a man who undergoes arrest, (and) also suffers torture.<sup>2</sup> There occurs on that account a sudden culmination in imprisonment, and many other people feel (aggrieved by it). (All practically as in the Dhauli Text). This is the rule of conduct : who of you sees (the thing), (by him) the (mode) of discharge of the debt is to be impressed :<sup>3</sup> Such and such is the instruction of the Beloved of the gods. (All practically as in the Dhauli Text). When the Commissioners<sup>4</sup> will go out on tours of inspection, without abandoning their own duties, they (will) execute also this as the king's instruction is.

1. See Glossary.

2. Hultzsch, "although you are in prosperous circumstances, it happens frequently that a single person undergoes imprisonment and suffers harsh treatment."

3. It means "he is to exhort other officers to discharge their obligation to the king."

4. See Glossary.



## II

## [ Dhauli Text ]

By the word (of command) of the Beloved of the gods the *Kumāra* Viceroy and the *Mahāmātras* at Tosali are to be told : Whatsoever I perceive (as good), that I wish, (intending,) I would fulfil it by action and achieve by (some definite) means. And this is considered by me to be the principal means, (namely), that which is (my instruction) to you. (To me all men are like) my (progeny). Just as in the case of the progeny I wish, that they should be connected with all good and happiness, just (so is my wish in the case of all men). It may occur to the unconquered borderers—What does the king really intend for us? This indeed is my wish, which, I desire, should reach the borderers : The Beloved of the gods desires, “May they on my account be unworried and consoled, may they obtain happiness only from me, (and) no misery ;” Thus should it reach (them) : “The Beloved of the gods will forgive us, whom he can forgive.” They should indeed practise piety for my sake and secure this world and the world beyond. I myself am instructing you. I will be free from debt (I owe you) by this, instructing you and making my wishes known until indeed my fortitude and resolve remain firm. Acting thus is the work to be done and they are to be assured, whereby (they) will get to understand : “Just as a father, so is the Beloved of the gods to us, and just as for his own (dear ones), so does the Beloved of the gods feels compassion for us, and just as (his) progeny, so are we to the Beloved of the gods”. I myself, instructing you and making (my) wishes known, will be a server of the land.<sup>1</sup> For this purpose you are capable indeed of bringing assurance and good and happiness to them concerning this world and the world beyond; and thus acting, you will attain heaven and will (also) acquit yourselves of your debt to me. And for this purpose this writ is written here, whereby the *Mahāmātras* (concerned) shall be employed eternally for bringing assurance to and stimulating the practice of piety among those borderers. And this script is to be heard on every first full-moon day of the new season of four months and under the *Tishya* asterism,<sup>2</sup> if desired, it ought to be heard<sup>3</sup> even by a single person also at the opportune moments in the interval between the *Tishya* (days). Thus acting, you will be able to fulfil (it).

1. According to J. “Instructing you and making the wishes known until my fortitude and resolve remain firm, I will be a server of the whole land.”

2. i.e., on the *Tishya* day. See Glossary.

3. According to J. “And also in the interval this script is to be heard even by a single person should there be an opportune moment.”



### 3. MINOR ROCK EDICT

[Brahmagiri Text]

From Suvarṇagiri,<sup>1</sup> by the word (of command) of the Āryaputra<sup>2</sup> and the *Mahāmātras*,<sup>3</sup> the *Mahāmātras* at Isila<sup>4</sup> are to be wished good health and to be told thus : The Beloved of the gods commands : In more than two years and a half when I was a lay worshipper, I had not, as a matter of fact, been exerting myself strenuously for one year ; it is more than a year that the Order<sup>5</sup> was approached<sup>6</sup> by me and I was exerting myself strenuously. By this time, however, the men who remained unmixed in Jambudvīpa, have been commingled with the gods.<sup>7</sup> This indeed is the fruit of energetic effort.<sup>8</sup> Verily the greater man<sup>9</sup> alone is not able to obtain this, if (he) so desires, even the lesser man<sup>10</sup> exerting himself can attain the grand heaven. For this purpose this message is caused to be proclaimed, that the lesser and the greater men may strive for it and (even) my borderers may know (it), and long-enduring may be this energetic effort. And this matter will increase and will increase even immensely, will increase at least by one and a half.<sup>11</sup> And this message is caused to be proclaimed by the dispatch of 256<sup>1</sup> (missioners<sup>2</sup> or copies).

Thus said the Beloved of the gods : respectful attention must be paid to mother and father, likewise to seniors ; tender regard for living beings must be strengthened, truth must be spoken, these very attributes of piety must be propounded ; likewise the teachers must be honoured by pupils with submissiveness and it must be fittingly propounded to the teacher's<sup>3</sup> relatives—"This is the ancient tradition,<sup>4</sup> and a thing of long standing is this, thus should it be practised." Written by Chapaḍa the Scribe.

1,2,3,4. See Glossary.

5. i.e., the Buddhist Fraternity or Brotherhood, the representatives of the Saṅgha. 6,7. See Glossary. 8. Hultsch, "zeal".

9. i.e., "a person of superior position", "an officer of superior rank".

10. i.e., "a person of inferior position", "a subordinate officer".

11. Bhandarkar, "one-and-a-half fold".

1. Or, "by the date of 256 (years)". See Glossary.

2. As suggested by V. A. Smith. 3. Justified by J ; āchariyasa nātikā.

4. i.e., "the time-honoured custom", "the good old rule", "the *sanātana-dharmah*".



## [Yerragudi Text]

Thus saith the Beloved of the gods : In more than two years and a half, when I was a lay worshipper, I had not, as a matter of fact, been exerting myself strenuously for a year, and when, more than a year, the Order was approached by me, I was exerting myself strenuously. And by this time the men who remained unmixed, have now been mixed. This indeed is (the fruit of) energetic effort. (Not) the greater man alone,<sup>5</sup> even the lesser man exerting himself is able to attain the grand heaven. And for this purpose this message is proclaimed, that the lesser and the greater men shall strive for it and my borderers, too, may know (it), and long-enduring may be this energetic effort. (This matter) will increase even immensely, will increase at least by one and a half. And this message is proclaimed by the dispatch of 256 (missioneresses or copies).<sup>1</sup>

Thus saith the Beloved of the gods : According as the Beloved of the gods said, so should it be done, the *Rajjuka* (concerned) is to be instructed. He will then<sup>2</sup> instruct the populace of the *janapada* (under him), and (also) the *Rāshṭrikas* :<sup>3</sup> Respectful attention is to be paid to mother and father, likewise respectful attention is to be paid to superiors, love is to be cherished towards people, truth is to be spoken, these attributes of piety are to be propounded. You instruct thus by the word (of command) of the Beloved of the gods. Thus instruct the elephant-riders, the *Kārunakas*,<sup>4</sup> the chariot-trainers, and the Brahmins.<sup>5</sup> You set thus (your) pupils just as the ancient usage is—This is to be respectfully attended to indeed<sup>6</sup> for the sake of honour of the teacher. Or again, if<sup>7</sup> (there be) relatives of the teacher, this should likewise be fittingly propounded to (his) relatives, so also among the citizens<sup>1</sup> should (it) be fittingly propounded, so that it may be excessively bright<sup>2</sup>. Thus commands the Beloved of the gods.

5. Here "is able" is redundant.

1. Or, "by date 256 (years)".

2. Literally, "now".

3,4 See Glossary.

5. As distinguished from the Brahmin ascetics.

6. Here *va* is treated as=*vā*.

7. Literally, "as".

1. According to Sahni's reading, "the pupils of others."

2. Correcting *tiroke* to *tireke*, "may be excessive."



## (Rūpnāth Text)

Thus saith the Beloved of the gods : For more than two years<sup>1</sup> and a half, when I was a lay worshipper<sup>2</sup>, I had not, as a matter of fact, exerted myself strenuously<sup>3</sup>, and when, however, for more than a year I was in contact with the Order, I exerted myself strenuously. The gods who by this time were unmixed in Jambudvīpa, have now been mixed (with men). This indeed is the fruit of energetic effort. And this cannot be obtained by the greater man (alone), even the lesser man exerting himself is able to attain the heaven, however grand. And for this purpose (this proclamation is made), that the lesser and prominent men shall exert themselves, and the borderers, too, may know (it), that this very kind (of energetic effort<sup>4</sup>) may be long-enduring. Verily this matter has increased,<sup>5</sup> will increase, and that immensely, will increase at least by one and a half. And this matter is to be written on rocks, and should here be a stone-pillar, (it is) to be written on the stone-pillar, and in the letter hereof<sup>6</sup> should it be dispatched<sup>7</sup> everywhere,, as far as your jurisdiction<sup>8</sup> (goes). (When) the proclamation was made by dispatch, 256 (missioners or copies) were dispatched<sup>9</sup>.

1. I find at last that the two letters, read *sake*, should be read *san(i)* and connected with *va* before *ya*. 2. I now definitely maintain that the three letters, *pa ka sa*, read from left to right, should be read *pa sa ke*.

3. Here this part of the statement differs from that in Bra, Si, Ja and Ye.

4. I think *pakāṛā* was a mistake for *pakama*.

5. Literally, "increased".

6. *i.e.*, in this literal form.

7. Hultsch, "you must dispatch (an officer)". 8. Hultsch, "as far as your district (extends)".

9. Or, "by date, 256 (years) elapsed."

## [Sahasrām Text]

(All practically as in Rūpnāth Text). And this matter will increase and will increase even immensely<sup>1</sup> by more than one and a half,<sup>2</sup> will increase at least by one and a half.<sup>3</sup> And this proclamation (is made) by dispatch (of) 256, which is to say (in words), two hundred with fifty-six. And cause this matter to be written on rocks, or where are stone-pillars, cause it to be written also there. Written by Hita (?)

1. According to Bhandarkar, "And this object shall grow, indeed shall grow profusely". 2. The Sahasrām is the only text which lays stress on the adverbial expression "one and a half" in this form.

3. Note that the Gavimaṭh, Pālkiguṇḍu and Māski texts stop just here.

4. Or, "by date of 256 (years)".



## [Māski Text]

(The proclamation) of Aśoka, Beloved of the gods : For (more than) two years and a half, when I was a lay worshipper of the Buddha,<sup>1</sup> (I had not exerted myself strenuously, (but) for more than (a year) and when I was in contact with the Order, I entered upon (a career of) exertion. The gods who, previously in Jambudvīpa, were unmixed with men, have now been commingled. Even the lesser man, devoted to piety, is able to achieve this object. It is not to be viewed thus—The prominent man may indeed achieve this. The lesser man and the prominent one should be told : Acting thus indeed, one fares well. The said matter (will) thus endure long<sup>2</sup> and will increase by one and a half.

---

1. See Glossary.

2. Literally “(will be) long-enduring”.



#### 4. BHĀBRU EDICT

The Magadhan king<sup>1</sup> Priyadarśin having saluted the Order, said :<sup>2</sup> (I wish you) health and welfare.<sup>3</sup> (It is) known to you Venerable Sirs, how far (goes) my veneration for and sincere faith in the Buddha, the Doctrine and the Order. Whatever, Venerable Sirs, is addressed by Buddha the Blessed One is well addressed<sup>4</sup> indeed. What, however, Venerable Sirs, suggests to me : "Thus will the Good Faith be long-enduring," that I consider proper to declare—These, Venerable Sirs, are the texts of the Doctrine :

- 1) "The Vinaya Exalted,"<sup>5</sup>
- 2) "The Traditions of the Elect,"<sup>6</sup>
- 3) "The Future Dangers (of the Faith),"
- 4) "The Poem<sup>7</sup> on Muni,"
- 5) "The Discourse on Quietude,"
- 6) "The Questions of Ūpatishya," and
- 7) "The Admonition to Rāhula" which was addressed by Buddha the Blessed One concerning falsehood.<sup>8</sup>

I wish, Venerable Sirs, that many monks<sup>9</sup> and nuns shall constantly hear and bear in mind these texts<sup>10</sup> of the Doctrine ; so also (shall) the lay worshippers, male and female. For this (purpose), Venerable Sirs, I cause this to be written, that they will know my intention.

---

1. Hultzs. "The Māgadha king." But according to the phraseology of the Text, King Priyadarśin is claimed as a Magadhan by his nationality.

2. Or. "paying homage to the Order, said."

3. Here it means "comfort". "Welfare" is almost the same formation in English as *phāsuviḥāra* in Pali.

4. Or. "said", "spoken".

5. The Aṅguttara passage with which this text is correctly identified by Mr. S. N. Mitra is one in which the Vinaya is exalted.

6. I accept Dharmananda Kosambi's identification of this text with the passage in the Aṅguttara Nikāya, II, No. 28, which is described by Buddhaghosa as the Mahā-ariyavaṃsa Suttanta.

7. Literally, "The Stanzas".

8. The descriptive clause was intended to distinguish the particular discourse from others bearing the same title.

9. Or, "many monks shall generally".

10. Technically, "systematic statements,"



## 5. SEVEN PILLAR EDICTS

### I

Thus saith King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods : This Edict of the Law of Piety is caused to be written by me anointed twenty-six years. The objects here and hereafter are difficult of fulfilment except by the very best<sup>3</sup> longing for piety, by the very best self-examination, by the very best attention, by the very best fear (of public criticism), by the very best zeal. This yearning for piety and (this) longing for piety has, as a matter of fact, increased day by day and will increase as well by my inculcation of piety. And<sup>4</sup> my officers,<sup>5</sup> too, those of superior and those of inferior and those of middle ranks, abide by and fulfil (it), and are able to incite<sup>6</sup> others ; so also the Wardens of the Marches.<sup>1</sup> This verily is the sanction, namely, this protection by piety, provision by piety, pleasing by piety, and<sup>2</sup> guarding by piety.

3. Literally, 'foremost'.

4. Justified by DT.

1. See Glossary.

5. See Glossary.

2. Justified by A.

6. Here in a good sense.

### II

Thus saith King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods : Piety is good. But what is this piety ? (It is that which consists in) little evil,<sup>1</sup> manifold good,<sup>2</sup> pity,<sup>3</sup> liberality,<sup>4</sup> truthfulness<sup>5</sup> (and) purity. (As for liberality), even the gift of the eye<sup>6</sup> has been made by me in various forms, to bipeds and quadrupeds, to birds and aquatic beings<sup>7</sup> diverse favours have been done by me, up to the grant of the boon of life,<sup>8</sup>

1. I do still feel difficulty in equating the Aśokan term *āsinava* with the Ardhamāgadhī *aṇhaya*, which is Sanskritised as *aśnaya*. To me, *ādinava*, interpreted by Buddhaghosa as *upaddava*, and by Amarakosha as *kleśa*, is the corresponding Pali term which is derived as *ā+dīna+va*, literally meaning "that which is full of wretchedness." Apparently Aśoka's term *āsinava*=Sk. *āśīnava*.

2. Here it means "good deeds."

3. Here it means "showing pity."

4. Here it means "act of giving."

5. Here it means "speaking truth."

6. Cp. Wordsworth's line : "She gave me the eyes, she gave me the ears."

7. See the list in P.E. V.

8. i.e., by way of making them immune from killing. See P.E. V and VII,



many other good deeds, too, have been done by me. For this purpose this Edict of the Law of Piety is caused to be written by me — Thus shall they fall in with and it may be long-enduring. And he who will fall in with it, will do a meritorious deed.

### III

Thus saith King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods : (A person) looks back to a good deed indeed, (saying to himself), "This good deed has been done by me," but he does not look back to his sinful deed, (saying to himself,) "This sinful deed has been done by me, or this goes by the name of evil." This, as a matter of fact, is difficult of review. Thus, of course, should it be seen to—"These are the things that lead to evil, such as fierceness, cruelty, anger, vanity, malignity,<sup>1</sup> due to (which) indeed I ought not to make myself liable to criticism."<sup>2</sup> This should be greatly seen to—"This is for my interests here, while this is for my interests hereafter."

---

1. See Glossary.

2. Or, "I ought not to have me blamed."

### IV

Thus saith King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods : This Edict of the Law of Piety is caused to be written by me anointed twenty-six years. My *Rajjukas* are placed over many hundred thousands of beings among men ; the hearing of case<sup>1</sup> or the passing of sentence

---

1. Here I have followed the Sanskrit meaning of the term *abhihāle*, employed in the sense of *abhiyoga*, "plaint" or "complaint." In Pali, the word means "bringing, offering, gift." See *Saṁvutta-N.* I, p. 82 ; *Suttanipāta*, verse 710 ; *Jātaka*, I, p. 81 (*āsanābhihāra*). Following this meaning, Hultsch translates : "the rewards." Jayaswal, "(the department of) *abhihāra* (war), *daṇḍa* (Home department)" (*Hindu Polity*, Pt. II, p. 145).



which is their (charge) is made by me a matter for (their)<sup>1</sup> own concern,<sup>2</sup> so that the *Rajjukas*, confident and fearless,<sup>3</sup> may initiate proceedings,<sup>4</sup> may bring good and happiness<sup>5</sup> to the people of towns and countrysides, and do favour (to them), will know what causes happiness and distress, and will exhort the people of towns and countrysides consistently with the principle of piety,<sup>6</sup> intending that they may attain the objects here and hereafter. The *Rajjukas*, moreover, will love<sup>7</sup> to serve me,<sup>8</sup> (and) will respond also to my *Purushas*<sup>9</sup> aware of my wishes. They, too, will faithfully intimate to them<sup>10</sup> (the means) whereby the *Rajjukas* will be able to please me. Just as, to be sure, (a person) feels confident<sup>11</sup> after making over his offspring<sup>12</sup> to an expert nurse,<sup>13</sup> (thinking)—“The expert nurse will be able to comfortably bring up my offspring,” so my *Rajjukas* are appointed for the

1. According to Mr. S. N. Mitra, Aśoka made that his own concern, which is to say, he relieved the *Rajjukas* of their judicial duties.

2. Mookerji, “their (jurisdiction of) law and justice is made by me subject to their control”; Hultzsch, “the rewards or punishments by them are left to their discretion.”

3. Or, “confidently and fearlessly,” “with confidence and without fear.”

4. Hultzsch, “they should perform (their) duties.”

5. Cp. Pali *upadahati dukkham* in *Anguttara-N*.

6. I take *dhammayutena* to be an adverb, meaning *dhamma-avirodhena*. In the present context, V. A. Smith and Lüders treat *Dhammayuta* as a collective designation of certain officials, say, those belonging to the department of the *Dharmamahāmātras*.

7. According to Kern, *laghamti*=*arhanti*, which means “deem it worth while”, “are able.” I take it to be the future tense of a root like  $\sqrt{rañj}$ . Note that the remaining verbs including *chaghamti* are all in the future tense.

8. Or, “to obey me.” 9. Hultzsch, “Agents.” Here the word *pulisānī* is definitely an Acc. plural.

10. i.e., the *Rajjukas* or modes of action. Hultzsch, “those people.”

11. Or, “is comforted.” 12. I have adopted Bhandarkar’s rendering.

13. Literally, “midwife.”



good and happiness of the country-people.<sup>1</sup> Whereby they being fearless, confident (and) undistracted,<sup>2</sup> may initiate proceedings, to that purpose the hearing of case or the passing of sentence by the *Rajjukas* is made by me a matter for (their) own concern. This indeed is to be wished, that (there) may be uniformity in procedure and uniformity in punishment.<sup>3</sup> And my application of safeguard<sup>4</sup> goes so far even (that)<sup>5</sup> to men who are put in prison, on whom the sentence is passed, (and) who are condemned to death are given three days' rope,<sup>6</sup> so that either (their) relatives will persuade them (the *Rajjukas*) to revise decision for sparing life, or should there be none to persuade,<sup>7</sup> they will offer gifts or observe fasts for good hereafter. My wish verily is—Thus even within the limited period they may attain the object hereafter and increases among the people the practice of piety of various kinds, (increases) self-control, (increases) the distribution of charity.

1. Here it means "the citizens."

2. Hultzsch, "unperturbed."

3. Hultzsch, "impartiality in legal proceedings and impartiality in punishment."

4. Hultzsch, "orders."

5. Or, "And even henceforth is (this) my application of safeguard."

6. i.e., "scope," "respite."

7. Going by the suggestion of Bhandarkar, the word *nāsanta* may be treated as an epithet of Yama or king of death, and the clause translated: "to appease the king of death." See Glossary.

8. Cf. *Arthaśāstra*, VII. 3. VII. 6: *niruddho deśakālābhyām, nirdiṣṭo deśe kāle*. For *niruddha* in the sense of *mata*, "dead," see *Sāratthappakāsinī*, Siamese Ed., II, p. 101: *tadā mato niruddho 'ti vuchhati*. Mookerji, "when the time (of grace) has expired"; Bühler, "even in the time of their imprisonment"; Senart "or in a closed dungeon"; F. W. Thomas, "though their hour of death is irrevocably fixed"; Hultzsch, "when the time (of respite) has expired."



## V

Thus saith King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods : These creatures are declared inviolable<sup>1</sup> by me anointed twenty-six years, namely,<sup>2</sup> parrots, *mainas*, *arūnas*,<sup>3</sup> Brahmany ducks, wild geese,<sup>4</sup> *nandīmukhas*,<sup>5</sup> *gelāṭas*,<sup>6</sup> bats,<sup>7</sup> small *pīpīlikas*,<sup>8</sup> terrapins,<sup>9</sup> boneless fish,<sup>10</sup> *silurus*

1. i.e., "not liable to be killed."

2. Here the choice lies between "namely" and "such as" (Mookerji). The expression, "these creatures," suggests a complete list, while from the manner of enumeration it appears to be a typical only.

3. Bhandarkar construes *alune*, "red" or "ruddy" as an adjective to *chakravāke*, which seems untenable. Going by Hindu mythology, the *arūṇa* may be taken as a generic name of all rapacious birds of prey, eagles, ospreys, vultures and kites.

4. Or, "swans."

5. Literally, those having a cheerful face." In the commentaries on the *Praśnavyākaraṇa* and *Aupapātika Sūtras*, the *nandīmukha* is taken to be the name of a species of *mainas* (*sārikā-viśeṣaḥ*), while in the *Charaka* and *Suśruta*, the *chakravāka*, the *hamsa* and the *nandīmukha* are described as aquatic birds.

6. Monmohan Chakravarti inclines to identify the *gelāṭa* with the *golatikā* in the *Taittirīya-Saṁhitā*, V. 5. 16. The *gelāṭa* may be identified with the *gorāṭi* of Hemchandra representing a species of *sārikā*.

7. Bhandarkar, "flying foxes."

8. Generally translated "queen ants," which is out of place in a list of birds. Here *ambā*, Pali *ambakā*, means "small, and the *pīpīlikas* are *pī-pī*-sounding aquatic birds, the *jal-piñ-piñ* of Bengal. Or, "small *kapila*." See Glossary.

9. Although *daḷī* or *duḷī* technically means "female tortoises," I prefer to take the word in its general sense to mean "terrapins," as suggested by Mookerji.

10. Prawns are hitherto mentioned as an instance of boneless fish. But it is difficult to think that "prawns" were not then eaten by the men of Middle Country. Buddaghosa (*Sāratthappakāsinī*, Siamese Ed. II, p. 200) mentions "earthworms" (*gaṇḍuppāda*) as typical of boneless or invertebrate (*anaṭṭhi*) beings. Jelly or star fish may be a better instance than prawns.



*boalis*,<sup>1</sup> *gaṅgāpuppuṭas*,<sup>2</sup> *saṃkuja* fish,<sup>3</sup> *kaphaṭasayakas*,<sup>4</sup> leaf-hares,<sup>5</sup> Bārāsing stags, bulls set free(?),<sup>6</sup> certain species of vermins,<sup>7</sup> rhinoceroses,<sup>8</sup> white pigeons,<sup>9</sup> village pigeons,<sup>10</sup> all quadrupeds that do not come into use, nor are eaten.<sup>11</sup> Those she-goats and ewes and sows with young or in milk are inviolable, and also their young ones within six months of age.<sup>12</sup> No cocks are to be caponed. Husks with living things are not to be burnt; forests for nothing or for harming life are not to be caused to burn. A living being is not to be nourished with a living being. On the three *chāturmasī* days,<sup>13</sup> on the *Tishyā* full-moon day,<sup>14</sup> on the three (*uposatha*) days—the fourteenth day, the fifteenth day (and) the first day of a lunar half-month, and

1. I assume that *vedaveyaka* is a mistake for *chedaveyaka*=*chitravallika*.

2. *Puppuṭa* is the name of a disease, of swelling of the palate and the tongue. Accordingly *gaṅgāpuppuṭa* must be the name of a river fish, of which the body is a swollen mass of flesh. It may have been a local name of porpoises, popularly classed with the fish, or of the frog-like fish called *pottā* in East Bengal.

3. Hitherto identified with skate.

4. Hitherto equated with *kamaṭha-śalyaka*, meaning "tortoises and porcupines," which is improbable as the rest of the names are each a single name instead of a *dvanda* compound. According to Morris, *kaphaṭasayaka*=*kapāla-sayyaka*, "living in shells." It may simply be the Aśokan equivalent of *kaṇṭha-śāyin*, "sleep-feigning animals," or *kaṇṭha-śalyaka* "fish with delusive fins."

5. i.e., "squirrels." But *paṇnasase* may be treated as the same term as *paṇmṛiga*, "leaf deer," which is applicable to squirrels, monkeys, and the like.

6. The identification is still open to dispute.

7. Buddhaghosha takes the word *ukkapinḍa* to mean "cats, mice, lizards and mungooses" (*biḷāla-mūsika-godhā-muṅgusā*).

8. According to one of the glosses (Jātaka, V, p. 406., VI, p. 277), "rhinoceroses and *Bos frontalis*."

9. i.e., "doves." See Glossary.

10. i.e., pigeons that live in human localities.

11. See Glossary.

12. Here I have followed Mookerji's translation.

13. The term *chāturmasī* means the first full-moon day of a new season, occurring after the termination of the preceding period of four months. See Glossary.

14. i.e., the full-moon day of the month of *Pausha*.



invariably on the non-uposatha<sup>1</sup> day,<sup>2</sup> fish are not to be done violence to,<sup>3</sup> nor even sold; on these very days, in the elephant-forest (and) in the fishery<sup>4</sup> even other species of beings are not to be killed. On the eighth day, on the fourteenth day, on the fifteenth day of a lunar half-month, on the *Tishyā* (and) *Punarvasu* days,<sup>5</sup> on the three *chāturmasī* days, on every auspicious day,<sup>6</sup> bulls are not to be castrated, nor are to be castrated he-goats, rams (and) boars or even other (animals) that are usually castrated. On the *Tishyā* (and) *Punarvasu* days, on the *chāturmasī* day, during the *chāturmasī* half-month,<sup>7</sup> the branding of horses and cows<sup>8</sup> is not to be done. Until anointed twenty-six years, at this interval, twenty-five jail-deliveries have been made by me.<sup>9</sup>

1. *dhuvāye cha anupasoatham.*

2. *i.e.*, the eighth day of a lunar half-month.

Wrongly rendered "on all fasting days."

3. *i.e.*, caught or killed.

4. Mookerji, "preserves of fishermen."

5. See Glossary.

6. Mookerji, "at festivals."

7. *i.e.*, the first fortnight or lunar half month after the termination of the preceding period of four months.

8. Or, "cattle."

9. Mookerji rightly observes: "The twenty-sixth is thus the current year, and not the year that has expired, since up to this time there have been only twenty-five liberations of prisoners. Thus we may take it as a general rule that all years mentioned in the Edicts are the current years of the reign of Asoka" (Asoka, p. 184, f.n. 6).



## VI

Thus saith King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods : For the good and happiness of the world was the Edict of the Law of Piety caused to be written by me anointed twelve years, that they not violating<sup>1</sup> that, might attain to this or that<sup>2</sup> (manner of) growth in piety. "Thus will be the good and happiness of the world," I have been reflecting upon,<sup>3</sup> this just as in respect of the relatives so in that of those who stand near, so in that of those who are far away—"What (sort of) happiness shall I bring them, and shall provide accordingly." Likewise I have been reflecting in respect of all bodies ; all sects, too, have been honoured by me in various ways of honouring. But that which is this personal approach<sup>4</sup> is considered the chief (way) by me. This Edict of the Law of Piety is caused to be written by me anointed twenty-six years.

---

1. *apahatā*=*aprahṛitā* or *aprahatā*. See Glossary.

2. Mookerji. "that and that."

3. Mookerji, "am attending to."

4. Or, "personal visit," "personal meeting," "personally waiting upon."

## VII

Thus saith King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods : Those who in the ages gone by were kings wished thus : How may the people (sufficiently) grow with the growth in piety ? But they did not sufficiently grow with the growth in piety. This King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods, saith thus : This occurred to me—"Also in the ages gone by, thus wished the kings : How may the people sufficiently grow with the growth in piety ? But they did not sufficiently grow with the growth in piety. How indeed may these people fall in with, how verily may they sufficiently grow with the growth in piety, how surely might I uplift them with the growth in piety ?" This King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods, saith thus : This occurred to me—"I will cause the proclamations of the Law of Piety to be proclaimed, I will cause instructions in the Law of Piety to be imparted. The



people hearing these, will fall in with, elevate themselves, and greatly grow with the growth in piety." For this purpose have the proclamations of the Law of Piety been caused to be ordered, so that even the *Purushas* who are placed over many people will inculcate as well as promulgate these. The *Rajjukas*, too, are placed over many hundred thousands of beings; even they are commanded: "Thus and thus instruct the people devoted to piety."

Thus saith Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods: With this very end in view, the monumental acts of piety have been done,<sup>1</sup> the *Dharma-mahāmātras* have been appointed, (and) the proclamations of the Law of Piety have been made by me.

Thus saith King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods: The banyan trees,<sup>2</sup> too, have been caused to be planted on roads, wishing that they will provide shade for cattle and men, the mango-groves have been caused to be planted, the wells<sup>3</sup> as well have been caused to be excavated at every half *kos*, and resting places have been caused to be constructed; many watering-places have been established by me, here and there, for the enjoyment of beasts and men. But slight is this enjoyment indeed. In various ways of comforting has indeed the world been comforted by former kings, too, and by me. "Let them fall in, as a matter of course, with this tradition of piety"—from this motive this has been done by me.

Thus saith Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods: Those my *Dharma-mahāmātras*, too, are employed in various matters, in matters of royal favour; and they are employed also among all sects of recluses as well as householders.<sup>4</sup> In respect of those of the *Saṅgha*, too, has it been ordained by me that these will be occupied; likewise in matters concerning the *Brāhmaṇas* (and) the *Ājīvikas*,<sup>5</sup> too, has it been ordained by me that these will be occupied. In matters concerning the Nir-

---

1. Literally, "pillars of piety." The monumental acts as enumerated in the paragraph which follows. See Glossary.

2. Typifying all shade-trees. 3. Wells, tanks, ponds, etc.

4. Mookerji, "employed in various kinds of business, in matters of royal favour, both of ascetics and of householders; among all sects also are they employed."

5. According to Bhandarkar, Brahmanical *Ājīvikas* as distinguished from non-Brahmanical. See Glossary.



granthas,<sup>1</sup> too, has it been ordained by me that these will be occupied. In matters concerning various (other) sects,<sup>2</sup> too, has it been ordained by me that these will be occupied. Specifically are employed these and those *Mahāmātras* among these and those (sects), but my *Dharma-mahāmātras* are employed among these<sup>3</sup> as well as all other sects.<sup>4</sup>

Thus saith King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods : This and many other chief officers are occupied with the dispensing of charities, both of mine and of the queens, and in connection with all my households they in various forms found<sup>5</sup> these and those institutions of satisfaction,<sup>6</sup> both here and in (other) quarters.<sup>7</sup> It has also been ordained by me that these will be occupied with the dispensing of charities of (my) sons and of other princes of the royal blood.<sup>8</sup>

\*[Thus saith King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods : The proclamations of the Law of Piety are also made by me] for the edification of the Law of Piety (and) falling in with the tradition of piety.<sup>9</sup> This indeed is the edification of the Law of Piety and falling in with the tradition of piety, that those which are called pity,<sup>10</sup> liberality, truthfulness, purity, tenderness<sup>11</sup> and goodness will thus increase in the world.

Thus saith King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods : Whatever good deeds have indeed been done by me, that the world has fallen in with, and that they abide by :<sup>12</sup> and thereby have increased and will increase that which is called respectful attention to mother and father, that which is called respectful attention to superiors, that which is called following the advice of seniors by age, that which is called seemly

1. i.e., Jainas.

2. i.e., those not mentioned by name.

3. Those named.

4. Those not named.

5. Now I take the word to be *paṭithāpayamti*, Taking it to be *paṭipādayamti*, one may translate by "accomplish." Taking it to be *pativedayamti*, Hultzscher translates by "are reporting." Bühler, "point out."

6. Hultzscher, "worthy recipients of charity"; Kern and Bühler, "sources of contentment," i.e., "opportunities for charity," in which case the statement might be translated : "create opportunities for charity."

7. i.e., in other places ; Hultzscher, "in other provinces." According to R.E. V, "in other outer towns." 8. Literally, "of other queens' and princess' sons."

\* Following the text as found inscribed "...and of other princes of the royal blood for the edification of the Law of Piety and falling in with the tradition of piety."

9. Hultzscher, "in order (to promote) noble deeds of morality (and the practice of Morality.)"

10. Hultzscher,

11. Better, "gentleness."

12. Hultzscher, "those the people have imitated and to those they are conforming."



behaviour to the Brāhmaṇas and the Śramaṇas, to the poor and the destitute, even to the slaves and servants.

Thus saith King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods : Whatever is this growth in piety among men, (that) has been promoted by this two-fold means : by the regulation of piety<sup>1</sup> and by persuasion.<sup>2</sup> There, however, that regulation of piety is of light effect, the greater effect is possible indeed by persuasion. The regulation of piety is, of course, this, that this has been ordained by me—These and these species are (declared) inviolable,<sup>3</sup> and also several other regulations of piety that have been made by me ; by persuasion indeed by far the greater growth in piety has been effected among men for the non-harming mental attitude to living beings, (and) for the non-killing of living creatures. It is for this purpose that this has been ordained—"May it last as long as (the whole posterity through the line of) sons and great-grandsons remains and the moon and the sun endure, and may it accordingly be followed. Thus indeed followed, the objects here and hereafter are secured.

This Edict of the Law of Piety is caused to be written by me anointed twenty-seven years.

This the Beloved of the gods saith : This Edict of the Law of Piety, where there are stone-pillars or stone-blocks, should there be made (inscribed), whereby this may be long-enduring.

1. Hultzsch, "moral restrictions."

2. Hultzsch, "Conversion."

3. Reference is to P.E.V.

4. Reference is to R.E. III, R.E. IV, etc.

## 7. SCHISM PILLAR EDICT

### I

#### Kauśāmbī Copy

The Beloved of the gods commands the *Mahāmātra* at Kauśāmbī : (None whosoever) in the Saṅgha made united (by me) will get a chance (to divide).<sup>1</sup>

And whoever will split the *Saṅgha*,<sup>2</sup> the monk or nun,<sup>3</sup> he (or she), for certain, should be made to reside in a non-residence<sup>4</sup> after being compelled to put on white robes.<sup>5</sup>

1. Hultzsch wrongly translates—"should not be received into the Saṅgha."

2. See Glossary.

3. See Glossary.

4. i.e., a residence other than Buddhist monastery.

5. Here 'white robes' may be taken either as mark of a householder or that of other religionists. See Glossary.





## II

## Sānchī Copy

(None) will get a chance to divide the Order of the monks and of the nuns made united as long as (the whole of posterity through the line of) sons and great-grandsons remains (and) the moon and the sun endure. (He) who, the monk or nun, splits the Order, should be made to reside in a non-residence after being compelled to put on white robes. This is indeed my wish, that the unity of the Order may be long-enduring.

## III

## Sārnāth Copy

1. The Beloved of the gods
2. who (gets a chance ?)
3. Pātaliputra (None) whosoever will get a chance to divide the Order. Whosoever,
- 4-11. the monk or nun, will split the Order, he (or she) must be made to reside in a non-residence after being compelled to put on white robes.

Thus should this ordinance be made known to the Order of monks and to the Order of nuns.

Thus saith the Beloved of the gods :

And one such copy of the edict has been placed in the office<sup>1</sup> so that it may be within your access. And cause exactly one such copy to be placed within the reach of the lay worshippers. And these lay worshippers, too, should come on the eighth day of the lunar fortnight in order to be convinced of its trustworthiness. And invariably on the eighth day of the lunar fortnight a *Mahā-mātra* by turn goes to attend the fast-day service in order to be convinced of its trustworthiness and to know its contents. And as far as goes your jurisdiction, you dispatch everywhere (copies) in the letter hereof.<sup>2</sup> Likewise dispatch to all fortified territories (copies)<sup>3</sup> in the letter hereof.

1. Or, "on the main road leading from the city." According to Bhandarkar, "in the *Cutchery*." See Glossary.

2. Hultsch, "dispatch ye (an officer) according to the letter of this (edict)."

3. Or, "to all fortified districts."





## 8. QUEEN'S EDICT

By the word (of command) of the Beloved of the gods the *Mahāmātras* everywhere are to be told : Whatever gifts<sup>1</sup> here are of the second queen, either mango-groves<sup>2</sup> or gardens<sup>3</sup> or alms-houses<sup>4</sup> or whatever something else<sup>5</sup> counts as of that queen, record all these (as)—“Of the second queen Kāluvāki,<sup>6</sup> mother of Tivara<sup>7</sup>”.

1. Literally, “whatever gift.”
2. Here the mango-grove typifies all fruit-gardens.
3. According to Buddhaghosa, the *ārāmas* may denote either “woodlands” or “orchards” or “flower-gardens”. But the word *ārāma* stands also for “retreats for the ascetics and recluses.”
4. Or, “charity-houses.”
5. Hultzsch simply, “whatever else.”
6. See Glossary.
7. As pointed out by Bühler, “Tivara occurs (a thousand years after Aśoka) as the name of a king of Kosala.” Fleet, Gupta Inscriptions, 293 ; E. I., Vol. VII, p. 103. See Glossary.

## 9. LUMBINI PILLAR-INSCRIPTION

(The spot) is worshipped by King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods, anointed twenty years, coming himself,<sup>1</sup> because the Buddha Śākyamuni is born here. The crowning stone-figure of a young elephant is caused to be made<sup>2</sup> and the stone-pillar is caused to be set up. Because the Blessed one is born here, the village of Lumbinī is made exempted from the religious cess<sup>3</sup> and made to pay one-eighth share (of the land produce).<sup>4</sup>

1. Hultzsch, “came himself and worshipped (this spot).” But *āgācha* is=Sk. *āgatya* and cannot be mistaken for *āgā* (=Pali *a g ā*) *cha* (a Copulative conjunction).

2. *i.e.*, “curved”. 3. Hultzsch, “made free from taxes.”

4. Or, “made entitled to a largess of money.”



## 10. NIGĀLI SĀGAR PILLAR INSCRIPTION

The *Stūpa* of Buddha Konāgamana was enlarged for the second time<sup>1</sup> by King Priyadarśin, Beloved of the gods, anointed fourteen years, and the (stone-pillar) is caused to be set up (by him) anointed (twenty) years.

1. Hultsch, "to the double (of its original size)," which does not seem tenable. In Pali *dutiyam* means "for the second time." Cp. the Refuge Formula: *dutiyam pi Buddhāṃ saraṇaṃ gacchhāmi*.

## 11. THREE BARĀBAR HILL-CAVE INSCRIPTIONS

### I

#### BANYAN-CAVE INSCRIPTION

This Banyan-cave<sup>1</sup> is given to the Ājīvikas<sup>2</sup> by King Priyadarśin anointed twelve years.

1. *i.e.*, the cave having a banyan tree near by for its cognizance.
2. See Glossary.

### II

#### KHALATIKA HILL-CAVE INSCRIPTION

This cave in the Khalatika Hill<sup>1</sup> is given to the Ājīvikas by King Priyadarśin anointed twelve years.

1. See Glossary.

### III

#### KHALATIKA HILL-CAVE INSCRIPTION

King Priyadarśin is anointed nineteen years (when) this cave in Mt. Khalatika is given by me to the Ājīvikas for retreat from the torrent of water.

1. Accepting the reading *supiye*, "in the very pleasant Khalatika (mountain)", and accepting the reading *tatiye*, "this third cave in the Khalatika (mountain)."





( 218 )

12. MISCELLANEOUS INSCRIPTIONS

I

REMNANT OF THE BUDDHIST FORMULA (?)  
BELOW THE THIRTEENTH GIRNĀR ROCK EDICT—  
LEFT SIDE.

1. ....their.....

II

WRITER'S SIGNATURE (?)  
BELOW THE THIRTEENTH GIRNĀR  
ROCK EDICT—LEFT SIDE

2. ....by the scribe (?)

III

LABEL FOR THE ELEPHANT SYMBOL  
BELOW THE THIRTEENTH GIRNĀR  
ROCK EDICT—RIGHT SIDE

The all-white elephant, "Procurer of happiness for all the world" by  
name.

IV

LABEL BELOW THE ELEPHANT SYMBOL  
ON THE KALSI ROCK—NORTH FACE

The superlative elephant.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Treating *gajatame*=*gajuttamo*, "The best elephant."

V

LABEL FOR THE ELEPHANT SYMBOL  
AT THE END OF THE SIXTH DHAULI ROCK EDICT

The White (elephant).



## GLOSSARY

As to R. E. I :—

1. *Devānampiya* : This as a general honorific is employed in its plural form in R.E. VIII as a substitute for *lājāne*, *rājāno* of other versions. A similar use of the Ardhamāgadhī variant *Devānuppiya* in the Aupapātika Sūtra has already been noted (ante, p. 1) in connection with the phrase, *Devānuppiyāṇaṃ ābhisekhe*, "consecration of the princes." In the same text, Sec. 40, Kūṇika, son of king Bimbisāra, is respectfully addressed as *bho Devānuppiyā* (*gaurave bahuvachanam*). Dr. Raychaudhuri (Political History, p. 220) points out that "in Rock Edict VIII of Aśoka, his ancestors, equally with himself, are styled *Devānampiya*." This is not, however, quite correct, for the reference in this edict as well as P.E. VII, is not specifically to his ancestors but indefinitely to all former rulers of India. In the inscriptions of Aśoka and with reference to him, *āt* has been often used in combination with *Piyadasī lājā*, and in places, alone as a shorter dignified and courteous form of reference, and not as a mode of address. In the Māski text of M.R.E., the word *lājā* or *rājā* is considered redundant in the introductory phrase, *Devānampiyasa Asokasa*. But the full royal title is met with in the three Nāgārjunī Hill-cave inscriptions of Daśaratha. The Pali Chronicle Dīpavaṃsa (Ch. XI) applies the appellation *Devānampiya* to Tissa, the ruler of Ceylon and contemporary of Aśoka and often employs it alone to refer to that king" (Bhandarkar, Aśoka, p. 7). The conventional use of the epithet in application to kings is to be found also in an epigraph from Ceylon (Epigraphia Zeylanika, I, p. 60 f.). In India, however, the epithet was altogether abandoned in all epigraphs later than those of Daśaratha. In the Harshacharita (i, p. 28), *Devānampiya* is employed as an honorific (*pūjāvachana*), but not as an epithet of a ruler. As for grammatical literature, Kātyāyana's Vārtika to Paṇini (vi, 3. 21) cites it as an instance of *Aluk Samāsa*, and Patañjali puts it under the Vārtika, *Bhavad-ādayaḥ*, to Paṇini, (v, 3. 14), on a par with such other honorific and auspicious terms or modes of address as *bhavat*, *dīrghāyus*, and *āyushmat* (*Bhavān-dīrghāyur-devānampiya-āyushmān*), thereby proving beyond doubt that up till his time it had not acquired the derogatory sense : *Devānampiya iti ca mūrkhhe*, in which it came to be interpreted by so late a writer as Bhaṭṭoji Dīkshita, author of the Siddhānta-kaumudī, or Hemachandra, author of the Abhidhāna-chintāmaṇi. According to the Manoramā : *Mūrkhā hi devānām prītiṃ janayanti devapaśutvād iti*. Elsewhere : *Yaḥ kasyachin na priyaḥ syāt sa devānampiyo mataḥ, anyathā tajjīvana-nirvāhasya aśakyatvāt*. And yet I find it difficult to endorse Dr. Radhakumud Mookerji's remark that this deterioration of the title in sense



was due to "later Brahmanical prejudice against the most distinguished Buddhist monarch" (Asoka, p. 109). The derogatory sense came into the head of Bhattoji Dīkshita and others not out of any sectarian prejudice against Aśoka for when they suggested it, they had not any tradition before them as to the employment of *Devānāmpriya* as a royal title associated with the name of any ancient king, particularly Aśoka. While rejecting Patañjali's opinion, they evidently took their stand on Pāṇini's aphorism, vi, 3. 21: *Shashṭhyā ākroṣe*, providing for no exception to it. In support of Dr. Mookerji one might indeed cite the statement in the Gārgī Saṁhitā, *sthāpayishyati mohātmā vijayaṁ nāma dhārmikam*, which Jayaswal translates: "the fool will establish the so-called conquest of Dharma" (J.B.O.R.S., IV, p. 261), and reminds one, according to Dr. Raychaudhuri (Political History, p. 304, f.n. 2), of the later meaning of *Devānāmpriya* ("fool," 'idiot like a brute'). But here *mohātmā* may just be a scribe's mistake for *mahātmā*. Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar characteristically observes: (Asoka, p. 8). "*Devānāmpriya* was thus an auspicious mode of address or honorific characterisation before the Christian era, confined to the kings, and was so used probably to indicate that the rulers were under the protection of the gods (*devas*)". I am inclined, however, to suggest that the then current royal title, of which the literal and safe rendering is "Dear unto the gods" or 'Beloved of the gods,' derived its significance from the ceremony of consecration at which the representative Vedic gods, Indra, Varuṇa, Mitra, Pushan, and the like were invoked by the officiating priest to bestow on the king specific favours in their gift. Accordingly its primary suggestion was that the rulers of the earth were supremely favoured by the gods, and secondarily only, protected by them. Thus I was once strongly in favour of translating it by "His Gifted Majesty" in preference to "His Sacred (and Gracious) Majesty." From Aśoka's own point of view, *Devānāmpriya* was not so much 'one who is dear unto the gods' as 'one who endears oneself to the gods (by his righteousness and acts of piety). The *devas* or gods were divided in the contemporary Buddhist literature into these three classes: (1) those by birth (*upapattidevā*), those by courtesy (*sammuti-devā*, kings, princes, etc.), and those by purity (*visuddhi-devā*, i.e., saintly *Brāhmins* and *Recluses*). According to Dīgha-N., II, p. 169, *piyo bahunnam, piyo=sokanāsano*.

2. *Piyadasī, Priyadraśi*: According to Dr. Bhandarkar (Aśoka, p. 6), *Piyadasī*, Sk. *priyadarśin*, is a *biruda* of Aśoka used as his personal name, and this *biruda* is the same in form and meaning as *Piyadassana*, Sk. *Priyadarśana*, 'one of gracious mien,' 'one of pleasant countenance', 'lovely to behold,' 'good-looking.' The introductory phrase, *lājina Piyadasinā* or *lājā Piyadasī*, occurring as it does in the Barābar Hill-cave Inscriptions, leaves no room for doubt that it is as good a personal name of the intended king as *Aśoka*, by which he is introduced in the Māski text of M.R.E. and represented in the Junāgarh



Rock Inscription of Rudradāman I. That *Piyadasī* is a personal name, and not a mere *biruda*, is borne out by the fact that where the name *Aśoka* is employed, there it is absent. Pali *Piyadassi* is the same kind of personal name of former Buddhas as *Atthadassi*, *Dhammadassi*, *Sabbadassi*, and *Anomadassi*, all met with in the *Buddhavaṃsa*, a Pali Canonical text of post-Aśokan Age. As for its application to Aśoka, Buddhaghosa, as noted (ante, p. 1), records a tradition according to which the Maurya prince *Piyadāso* (= *Piyadasso*, *Piyadassi*) assumed the name *Aśoka* at the time of his coronation. Hultzsch rightly observes: "Both *Piyadassi* and *Piyadassana*, 'of amiable appearance', occur repeatedly in the *Dīpavaṃsa* (Ch. VI) as equivalents of Aśoka, the name of the great Maurya king." In this connexion he draws our attention to the fourth act of the drama *Priyadarśikā* in which *Priyadarśikā* its heroine is called both *Priyadarśikā* and *Priyadarśanā*." In Indian literature, *priyadarśana*, *piyadassana* or *piadamśana* is an endearing term of personal description rather than a personal name. In the *Rigveda*, *Somarājā* alone is praised as *priyadarśana*. The association of *priyadarśana* with Soma or 'moon' is traceable also in the personal praise of Rāma in the *Rāmāyaṇa* (I. 1. 18): *Somavat priyadarśanaḥ*. Similarly the *Mudrārākṣha* (Act VI) affixes it to the name of Chandragupta, the grandfather of Aśoka: *piadamśanaṣṣa Chandasirino*. As a term of personal praise, it occurs also in the Nāsik Cave Inscriptions of Gautamī-putra-Śrī-Śātkarṇi. In the *Dīgha-Nikāya*, III, p. 167, where *piyadassana* has for its attributive synonym *sokanāsana*, "the reliever of sorrows", we read:

*Sukhuma-nayana-kusala-manujā 'Piyadassano' ti abhiniddisanti nam.*  
 "All able men of subtle insight will single him out as *Priyadarśana*." And in the *Dīpavaṃsa* (Ch. VI), too, *sudassana* (just another word for *piyadassana*) is employed for personal description of *Piyadassi*. The same Chronicle, whilst establishing synchronisms between the natural years of Mahinda's life and the stages of Aśoka's career as king, sets forth:

10th year of Mahinda=year of the Maurya king's accession;

14th year of Mahinda=year in which they consecrated Aśoka; and

20th year of Mahinda=year in which they consecrated *Piyadassi* (*Piyadass' ābhisiñchayum*).

In the same Chronicle (VI. 1), we have another synchronism, namely, that between 218 B.E. (Buddha Era) and year of *Piyadassana*'s coronation.

The second and third synchronisms are not intelligible except on the supposition that Prince *Priyadarśana* was first coronated under the name of Aśoka and subsequently under that of *Priyadarśin*. As we saw, Buddhaghosa records a tradition according to which Prince *Piyadāsa* (*Piyadassi*) assumed the title of Aśoka at the time of his coronation. The *Divyāvadāna* legend, however, definitely states that Aśoka was the personal name of the Maurya prince given him by his father Bindusāra at his mother's instance,



3. hevaṃ āha : This introductory clause, "Thus said" (*Evam āha*) was, according to the *Arthaśāstra*, to be employed in a royal writ (*rājaśāsana*) when it was meant to be a form of *prajñāpana* or intimation in the king's own words (ante, p. 10). *Etam āha*, "Said this," occurs in P.E. VII as a variant of *hevaṃ āha*. It is suggested that the Indian formula, *Devānampiye Piya-dasī lājā hevaṃ āha*, was adopted from the inscriptions of Darius that begin with the formula, *thatiy* (Sk. *śamsati*) *Darayvaush* (= *Dhārayavasuh*) *kshāyathiya* (= *kshetā*), "Saith the king Darius" and "became known in India through the political influence of Darius with a part of the Punjab" (Mookerji, *op. cit.*, p. 108). According to Dr. Mookerji, the formula "Thus saith the king Piya-dasi," is "absolutely singular in Indian Epigraphy, without any precedent or imitation." But even apart from the prescription in the *Arthaśāstra* regarding the use of the formula, it may be shown that the Pali Piṭakas repeatedly makes use of such archaic clauses as *Tāthāgato āho, evaṃvādī Mahāsamaṇo, Bhagavā etad avocha, Idam avocha Bhagavā, idam vatvā Sugato athāparam etad avocha Satthā*. The Indian literary convention from which the inscriptional formula could and probably did easily originate, is indeed still earlier. Compare, for instance, the Upanishadic clauses, *hovācha Yājñavalkyaḥ* (*Bṛihad Ar.*, IV. 5. 2), *evam āhur manishiṇaḥ* (*Kaṭha*, I. 3. 4).

✓ 4. Dhammalipi, Dhramadipi : Translated 'righteousness-edict' by Kern, simply 'edict' by Senart, 'religious edict' by Bühler, and 'moral rescript' by Hultzsch. Bhandarkar takes it to mean a writing containing a decree for the advancement of *Dhamma*, a record relating to the promotion and propagation of *Dhamma* (*Aśoka*, p. 282 f.). *Aśoka* himself, as pointed out by Bhandarkar, applies the name, *Dhammalipi*, only to two sets of records, namely, the Fourteen Rock and the Seven Pillar edicts. The name in the above sense is not applicable to the three dedicatory or donative inscriptions in the Barābar Hill-caves. The Minor Rock Edict is singled out as a form of *Aśoka's Dhamma-sāvana* or proclamation of a message of piety. The Schism Pillar Edict is promulgated as a *sāsana* or ordinance. The two Separate Rock Edicts are each called a *lipi*, evidently meaning a written form of the king's special and specific instructions to his Viceroy and responsible officials. In Bhandarkar's opinion, even the other inscriptions of *Aśoka*, except perhaps those engraved in the caves, "were records relating to the promotion and propagation of *Dhamma* and can with perfect propriety be designated *Dhammalipi*." But adhering to *Aśoka's* own nomenclature, by *Dhammalipis* we should understand only those written forms of his decrees or instructions by which he sought to encourage piety and expound its principles among his subjects, nay, among all peoples.

5. lekhitā, likhitā, lekhāpitā, likhāpitā ; Same in meaning as *nipista, nipespita* (R.E. XIII, XIV, Sh), *nipesita* (R.E. IV, Sh). Literally 'written',



Written in which sense? In the sense of 'engraved', 'incised', 'inscribed' in stone or in that of merely 'composed or drafted to be engraved for publication? After a sharp difference of opinion on this very point between us, Bhandarkar modifies his previous opinion and states his position thus: "It is not, however, an easy question to answer. Because the word *likh* which means 'to engrave' also means 'to write', and sometimes it is very difficult to understand which sense is intended" (Aśoka, p. 283). As a general criterion of distinction between the two meanings, he suggests that wherever the word *lekhitā* or *likhāpitā* occurs with the express purpose, *chilathitikā hotu*, 'let it be long enduring', it cannot but mean 'inscribed' (*op. cit.*, p. 285). Even in the case of R.E. I, of which the Dhauli and Jaugaḍā versions have *pavatasi* before *likhāpita* in the very first line, compelling one to translate the word by 'caused to be engraved' instead of merely 'caused to be written', he inclines to think that the reference to *pavata* (*parvata*) was not in the original draft of Aśoka but was inserted locally when it was incised at Dhauli and Jaugaḍā (*op. cit.*, p. 284). The word undoubtedly means 'caused to be written.' The question is—whether written in the sense of drafted or permanently engraved on a rock, pillar or stone-block? I do still maintain that everywhere Aśoka meant by it 'permanently engraved.' Even where the word is used without any reference to *pavata* or *silāthambha* there are indications that it was meant to convey the same idea. For instance, in R.E. XIV, Aśoka says that all of his *Dhammalipis* could not be engraved everywhere due to the extensiveness of his dominions. In M.R.E., the direction "have it (the *sāvana* or proclaimed message) engraved" (*likhāpayātha*, *Sahasrām*) is contrasted with the fact "it has been proclaimed" (*sāvanē kaṭe*, *sāvite*, *Rūpnāth*, *Yerraguḍi*). Similarly R.E. III embodied something which was 'commanded' by Piyadasī consecrated twelve years since (*dbādasavāsābhisitena āñapitaṁ*) and R.E. IV, something which was caused to be written in the same regnal year (*dbādasavāsābhisitena lekhāpitaṁ*). In case where *lipis* meant "written copies of an order on portable objects," the word used, e.g., in the Sārnāth text of the Schism Edict, is *nikhitā*, 'placed' or *vivāsāpayātha*, 'have it sent out'. It should also be noted that even where the word *pavatasi* does not precede *likhāpitā*, we have *hida* or *idha* (here, referring to the particular spot), e.g., in R.E. IV (Sh) *hida nipesitaṁ*, (Dh) *idha likhite*.

6. *idha*, *hida*: Literally 'here', but where? In the Gīrnār text of R.E. V, we have *Pāṭalipute* in lieu of *ia*, *hida* of other versions. The Gīrnār editor of the edict did the right thing by substituting *Pāṭalipute* for *idha* in the draft, as otherwise the meaning would not have been clear when read with the sequel, *bāhiresu* (*nagaresu*), 'and outer towns.' But in the context of R.E. I, the word, *idha* or *hida*, does not necessarily mean *Pāṭaliputra* only. Here it means the locality where the edict is promulgated, though by implication it was originally promulgated mainly with reference to the capital.



7. *na kimchi jīvaṃ ārabhitpā prajūhitavyam* : Literally "no sacrifice should be performed by immolating any form of life." Whether this is to be construed as a mandate or as a mere expression of opinion is the question. Considered in the light of P.E. V, it cannot but be construed as a mandate. But there is a great difference in purpose between R.E. I and P.E. V. In the former, Aśoka is concerned to prohibit the sacrificial slaughter of life, and in the latter, to promulgate a *dhammaniyama* restricting the slaughter of life. The prohibition of sacrificial slaughter of life went directly against secular Brahmanism. By *jīva* were evidently meant those animals or living things that were immolated or destroyed for the purpose of a sacrifice. The list of such animals, as supplied in the *Suttanipāta*, *Brāhmaṇa-dhammika-Sutta*, includes cows, buffaloes, elephants, horses, goats, rams, cocks and pigs, the last four creatures finding mention in P.E. V. The *thusa-homa* (*Dīgha*, I, p. 9) must have involved the destruction of animalculæ, for which reason Aśoka prohibited the burning of husks containing living things *tuse sajīve*, P.E. V). In the present edict, Aśoka must have thought of those animals that supplied meat for the feast, such as those (goats, rams, fowls and pigs) mentioned in the *Dīgha-nikāya*, *Kūṭadanta-sutta*, which formed a sequel to the religious rite in every popular form of sacrifice, as it does even now in that of *Śakti-pūjā*. The *yajña* involved, as a rule, the slaughter of life, and was accompanied by the offering of gifts as might be inferred even from the statement of the philosophic position of Pūraṇa Kāśyapa in the *Dīgha-nikāya*, I, p. 52 : *hananto ghātento chhindanto chhedāpento pachanto pāchento . . . . . dadanto dāpento yajanto yajāpento*. The opinion which ultimately gained ground in Indian religious thought went in favour of abolition of the immolation of animals and served to shift the emphasis from the sumptuous feast with meat dishes to *dāna* or humanitarian and philanthropic aspect of a sacrifice as well as to bring into bold relief by comparison and contrast of effects the superior values of ethical virtues and acquisition of higher knowledge and spiritual vision. The very same indeed in detail and substance is the trend of the teaching of the *Bhagavadgītā*, especially Chs. IV, XVI and XVII. This very trend of progressive religious thought was certainly behind the opinion of Aśoka as stated in R.E. I. Further, the *Kūṭadanta-Sutta* and other Pali texts preserve the noble tradition of some former rulers of India who had under the influence of that very progressive thought shown the moral courage in dispensing with *paśuvali* in performing a sacrifice.

✓ 8. *Samāja* : The same as Pali *samajja*, which is a phonetic equivalent of *samajya* or *samadya*. Pāṇini in his *Sūtra*, iii. 3. 69 : *sam-udor ajah paśushu*, contemplates a distinction between *samaja* and *samāja*, the former being applicable to an aggregation of animals, and the latter, to a congregation of men. *Paśūnām samājo, anyeshām samājo 'tha sadharminām* (*Amarakosha*, *Simhādi-*



varga). The word *samāja* is paraphrased by *nikāyaḥ*, meaning gathering, meeting (Amarakosha-Ṭikā). In R.E. I, *samāja* is associated with *yajña*, which is a religious function; in the Hāthigumphā inscription, with *usava* (*utsava*), which means 'a festive occasion', or 'festivity'. It was by the twofold means, namely, the display of *darpa* (contests), *nṛitya* (dances), *gīta* (songs) and *vādita* (instrumental music), and the organization of *usava* (festive occasions) and *samāja* (popular gatherings) that Khāravela sought to exhilarate the citizens of the Kalinga capital as joy celebration of success in his first military campaign. Thus it is opined in the Rāmāyaṇa : *Utsavaś cha samājaś cha vardhante rāshṭra-wardhanam*. "The festivity and popular gathering increase the popularity of the state." The Arthaśāstra, (I. 21. 18), too, recommends the organization of *yātrā*, *samāja*, *utsava* and *pravahaṇa*. According to the Commentary, *yātrā devatānām*, *samājo loka-samudayaḥ*, *utsavaḥ Indra-vasantōtsavādiḥ*, *pravahaṇam udyānabhojanādi*. The inseparable association of *samāja* with *utsava* is equally borne out by the Jātaka, II, p. 13 : *ussave ghosite mahāsamajjam ahosi*, "the festive occasion (holiday) having been announced, there was a large popular gathering." The term *nakkhatta* is generally used in Pali to denote the seasonal festivals, and the phrase *nakkhattam ghuttam*, *ghositam* (Jātaka, I, p. 50) is of the same import as *ussavam ghositam*. The phrase *nakkhattam kilati* (Jātaka, I, pp. 50, 250) conveys the idea of *nakkhatta-kilā*, which means 'the celebration of a festival, making merry, taking a holiday.' *Chaṇa* is just another word (Jātaka, III, p. 539), which may be treated as a synonym of *nakkhatta* or *ussava*. In Pali, the word *samajja* occurs in the sense of 'congregation, a fair, a show, theatrical display.' The primary sense of it is 'the coming together of men.' As for the connection between *ussava* and *samajja*, we read in the Uraga Jātaka Jātaka, II, p. 13 : *ussave ghosite . . . bahu manussā samajjadassanattam sannipatimsu*. "The festival having been declared, a great many men assembled to witness the festive gathering." Such popular gatherings were intended, according to the Hāthigumphā inscription, to witness the exciting contests and musical varieties. The contests, according to other authorities, were not only those between men and men but also those between animals and animals. The primary object, then, of *samajja* or *samāja* was the entertainment by *visūkadassana*, the exciting and amusing shows of which the typical instances are mentioned in the Dīgha-nikāya, I, p. 6. The list supplied consists not only in such musical varieties as dances, songs, instrumental music, pantomimes, ballad-recitations, minstrels' songs, and operas, not only in fights between the elephants, horses, buffaloes, bulls, goats, rams, cocks and quails, not only in magical and acrobatic feats, but in such manly contests as bouting, fight with sticks, boxing and wrestling and such martial and military shows as mockfights, roll-calls, manouvres, and reviews. This is amply corroborated by the description of scenes in the midst of a *samajja* as given in the Jātaka, III, p. 541 : *naṭehi chinṇam saha vākarehi | daṇḍehi yuddham pi samajjamajjhe*; also in Vidhura-Paṇḍita-J. So none need be surprised if in one text *samāja*



is associated only with musical performances as in the *Dīgha-nikāya*, III, p. 183 and in another only with duels as in the *Harivaṃśa*, VV, 4528-58. The following note on *samāja* is worth quoting from Mookerji's *Aśoka*, p. 129 f. : "The term *samāja* is also known in Sanskrit, but the usual form is *samāja*. In the *Mahābhārata*, the *samāja* figures as a Śaiva festival (Hopkins, *Epic Mythology*, pp. 65, 220) accompanied by drinking, song and dance. But the secular *samāja* is held in an amphitheatre (*raṅga*, *prekshāgāra*) with *śibikās*, camps, and *mañchas*, platforms, for the accommodation of different classes and corporations (*śreṇīs* and *gaṇas*) assembling (1) for a public feast with varieties of meat dishes, or to witness (2) a joust at arms, *Harivaṃśa*, VV, 4528-38, 4642-58, (3) a display of military manouvres (*Mahābhārata*, *Ādiparva*, Ch. 134 f.), or (4) a *svayamvara* ceremony accompanied by dancing, singing and music (*ibid.*, Ch. 185, cited by Bhandarkar). Thomas quotes the *Mahābhārata*, i. 185-29, which refers to a game being held in an arena, *samājavāṭa*, surrounded by platforms, *mañcha*, and hence the game might be animal fights. .... Kautilya in one passage (II, 25) refers to *utsava*, *samāja* and *yātrā*, where the drinking of wine was unrestricted for four days, and in another passage (XIII, 5) points out the conqueror's duty of conciliating the conquered people by respecting their national devotion to their country, their religion (*deśa-daivata*), and their institutions, viz., their *utsava*, *samāja* and *vihāra*. The word also occurs in Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra* (I, 4, 26), not in a technical but a general sense, of a gathering at the temple of Sarasvatī, once a month or a fortnight to hear the songs of local or outside musicians with dancing. Lastly, ..... Aśoka's grandfather, Chandragupta, used to hold annually a great festival for animal fights. There were butting contests between rams, wild bulls, elephants, and even rhinoceroses, and also races between chariots drawn by two oxen with a horse between them (Aelian)."

On *samāja*, Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, *J.B.Br.A.S.*, XXI, p. 395 f., I.A., 1913, p. 255. ; N. G. Majumdar, I.A., 1918, p. 221 f. ; F. W. Thomas, *J.R.A.S.*, 1914, p. 396 f. ; Raychaudhuri, *Political History*, 4th Ed., p. 276 f. .

9. Bahukam hi dosam samājamhi pasati : Aśoka saw many faults in the *samāja* associated with a *yajña*. The objectionable feature of a *yajña* was the slaughter of animals in the name of religion. The discouragement, not to say, stoppage of the *samāja* associated with a religious function was due to its objectionable features that are not specified but left only to be inferred : the merry-making, the drunkenness, the revelry, the infatuation, the mental distraction, the proneness to sensuality, the excitement of animal passion, and the like. The *Mahābhārata* speaks, as noted above, of a Śaiva festival, which was accompanied by drinking, song and dance. In the *Dīgha Nikāya*, I, p. 6, the Buddha found fault with the *religieux*, the *śramaṇas* and *Brāhmaṇas*, who habitually



witnessed the musical performances and thrilling shows. In the *Siṅgālovāda-Sutta* (*Dīgha*, III, p. 183), he disapproved frequent going to the *samajjas* on the part of a good householder, apparently due to the infatuation caused by them and the consequent neglect of household duties. It may be safely assumed that Aśoka thought of those features of the *yajña-samāja* that were inconsistent with the principles of the *Dhamma* inculcated by him.

10. *asti pi tu ckachā samājā sādhumatā* : There were, however, certain popular gatherings that might be approved of as good by him. By this observation Aśoka modified his general opinion about the *samāja*. There were *samājas* and *samājas*, some harmful, some beneficial. He did not specify the *samājas* that were in his opinion beneficial. In R.E. IV, he referred to the popular demonstrations of religion by which his predecessors, the former rulers of India, tried to increase piety among the ruled. In other words, he kept in view those forms of the *samāja* that had an educative value. The observation is important as indicating that his intention was not to prohibit the *yajñas* as such but just to get rid of their objectionable feature, the slaughter of animals, nor ~~was~~ it to condemn the *samājas* wholesale but just to enhance their cultural importance, and in this respect he may be shown to have followed in the footsteps of the Buddha and other great religious reformers of India.

11. *bahu-prāṇa-sata-sahasrāni* : What did Aśoka mean by many hundred thousands of lives that were daily killed in the royal kitchen for the purposes of curry? According to the *Mahāsutasoma Jātaka*, the cook used to prepare the meat of the quadrupeds and birds for royal dishes. In R.E. I, the edible quadrupeds are typified by the antelope (*maga*) and the edible birds, by the peafowl (*mora*). But many hundred thousands was exceptionally a large number. Even if it were a few hundreds, it is impossible to think that the total was represented by the quadrupeds and birds only. The quadrupeds, as might be inferred from P.E. V, comprised also pigs, and the birds, the ordinary fowls. The same edict alludes also to the killing of fish, without including which in the number, however exaggerated or modest, Aśoka's statement must have to be regarded as a baseless exaggeration.

12. *tī eva prāṇā ārabhare, etc pi pachhā na ārabhisare* : This was indeed a wonderful statement that since the promulgation of R.E. I only three creatures were being daily killed in Aśoka's kitchen, one deer and two peafowls, the former, too, not invariably, and that they, too, would not be killed afterwards. One may wonder why, if he could reduce many hundred thousands of



creatures to three or two, he should fail to stop the daily slaughter of one deer and two peafowls, particularly of the latter! As to the total stoppage of killing in the royal kitchen, there is no record to show that he had ever redeemed that promise, which, when first given out, was no more than a wishful thinking. Mr. C. D. Chatterjee cites the evidence of Buddhaghosa's *Sāratthapākāsinī* to prove that with the people of the Middle Country the meat of peafowls, etc. was a delicacy. But was it the actual reason for which Aśoka was unable to dispense with the irreducible minimum? It would not sound well in his mouth to say that his failure in this matter was due to his inordinate fondness for peafowls' flesh. There might as well be some other reason which is not revealed to us. The immediate effect of the step taken was the appreciable minimisation of the act of killing, while the course of his action was directed towards total abolition of it. And yet it cannot be suggested that he was contemplating to introduce and enforce the vegetarian diet in his household. The stoppage of killing of living things in his kitchen did not necessarily mean the stoppage of meat and fish diet. He was evidently acting on the accepted Jātaka maxim: Sin lieth not in eating but in killing. He set at the most a personal example before his subjects meaning it to act as an incentive to the non-killing of creatures with one's own hand even for purposes of curry. P.E. V amply attests that fishermen continued to catch fish and butchers to kill animals, undoubtedly for supply to their customers, and they might as well be caterers for the royal household.

15. *mago, moro* : The deer and the peafowl. In R.E. I, the former typifies edible quadrupeds, and the latter, edible birds. The antelope and other quadrupeds, peafowl and other birds that were killed for meat in order of preference. The P.E. V supplies a list of quadrupeds, birds and fish whose flesh was not eaten by men, particularly the people of the Middle Country. In Pali literature, the two words *migamaṃsa* and *moramaṃsa* are found associated together, e.g., in Buddhaghosa's *Sāratthappakāsinī*, Siamese Ed., II, p. 135 : *migamaṃsaṃ vā moramaṃsādīnaṃ vā aññataraṃ*. In *ibid*, I, p. 79, we have the phrase *sākuṇiko mora-tittirādayo sakuṇe māretvā*. Even subsequently Aśoka did not succeed in putting a stop to the killing of these quadrupeds and birds, and their names are not included in the list of those rendered immune from slaughter by law (*dhammaniyamena avadhiyāni kaṭāni*, P.E. V, P.E. VII).

As to R.E. II:—

1. *sarvata vijite* : Throughout the domain, throughout the dominions. Instead of *vijite* we have the word *vijaya-chake* in the Hāthigumphā inscription, and *vijaya-rājye* in some of the later Indian inscriptions. The word *vijita*



suggests that, in theory at least, each king held the realm by the right of conquest. If we are to believe the Buddhist tradition in Pali as well as Sanskrit, Aśoka came to possess the realm not by the right of succession but by that of seizure and of victory in a fratricidal war which ensued at the time of his father's death. His *vijita*, as described in R.E. XIV, was a vast and extensive one (*mahālake hi vijite*). The extent and boundary of his *vijita* were intended to be determined, first, by its position in relation to territories of the *Antas*, and, secondly, by the situation of the Rock Edicts. His realm considered along with territories of the *Antas* is said to have extended over a distance of six hundred *yojanas* (*chha-yojana-satāni*, R.E. XIII). According to Pali tradition, his wide realm was commensurate with Jambudvīpa. The force of *sarvata*, 'throughout', is that by it Aśoka meant not only those divisions and provinces that were directly under his rule or under that of his Viceroys but all semi-independent territories and tracts within his empire (*vide* R.E. V, R.E. XIII, and M.R.E., Yerragudi copy).

2. *Aṃtā*, *Prachāntā* : According to the Rājovāda Jātaka (No. 151), *pach-  
ckantabhūmi* is the border-land, outermost zone or frontier region of a king-  
dom, and *pachchanta-sīmā* is the boundary between it and the neighbouring  
kingdom. Starting from the *antonagara* or city proper, one reached the  
*bahinagara* or suburbs, from there the *janapada* or districts around, thence the  
*pachchanta-bhūmi*, and ultimately the *pachchanta-sīmā*. The Kathāvatthu, I,  
3, defines the *pachchantima janapadas* as places outside the Middle Country  
(*Majjhima janapadā*) as known to the Buddhists (Raychaudhuri, Political  
History, pp. 55, 120). Cp. also Papañcha-sūdanī, Seamese Ed., III, p. 673 : *Maj-  
jhīmadese kira Rājagahanagare rajjam kārente pachchante Takkasila-nagare  
Pukkusāti-rājā rajjam kāresi*). In this very sense *Pachchanta* is distinguished in  
the Sāratthappakāsinī, I, p. 151, from the *Majjhimadesa*. According to the  
Arthaśāstra, I, 16. 12, the *antas* (= *janapada-sīmā*, Comy) were to be placed in  
charge of the *Antapālas* and the *Aṭavis* in that of the *Aṭavīpālas*; the *antapāla-  
durga* as distinguished from the *puradurga* was to be built for the protection of  
frontiers (*ibid.*, II, 4. 22). The *antas* in this very sense were placed in charge  
of Aśoka's *Aṃta-mahāmātā* (P.E. I). In the Allahabad Prasasti of Samudra-  
gupta, the term *pratyanta* is applied to the frontier territories of North-east  
India, the Himalayan region and the tribal states of the Punjab (Raychaudhuri,  
*op. cit.*, p. 456), the rulers of which paid tribute to the Gupta emperor. As  
regards the edicts of Aśoka, it is directly in the sense of friendly rulers or ruling  
peoples of the bordering states, and indirectly only in that of the unconquered  
bordering territories (*aṃtā avijitā*, R.E. XIII) that the term *Aṃtā* or *Prachāntā*  
has been employed. The expression 'bordering' is to be understood not  
exactly in the sense of abutting on Aśoka's empire, but rather in that of 'mutu-



ally bordering,' 'mutually contiguous,' the nearest territory alone among the South Indian states abutting on Aśoka's *vijita*. Thus *Antas* or *Pratyantas* represented the neighbouring and mutually contiguous unconquered or unannexed states, as well as the utmost limit to which Aśoka's *dūtas*, envoys and ambassadors, were able to go either to do humanitarian works (R.E. II) or to propagate the noble message of his *Dhamma* (R.E. XIII), or in another sense, the 'borderers,' 'frontagers.' Though unconquered or unannexed in a sense, the fact of arranging for two kinds of treatment, the planting and supply of medicinal herbs, roots and fruits, the planting of shade trees, the sinking of wells, and the propagation of the *Dhamma* in them by Aśoka suffices to prove that the *Antas* or *Pratyantas* felt the brunt of his influence, political or cultural. Prof. Bhandarkar rightly observes (*Aśoka, op.cit.*, p. 40 f) that the *Antas* as enumerated in R.E. II and R.E. XIII 'fall into two groups, according as they had their dominions in or outside India.' The Yerraguḍi text of M.R.E., too, distinguishes between the *Antas* and Aśoka's *vijita*.

3. *Chodā Pādā Satiyaputo Ketalaputo ā Tambapannī* : They are, according to Prof. Bhandarkar, the rulers who constituted the first group of *Antas* who had their dominions in India (*Aśoka*, p. 41). His reason for treating them as rulers and not as ruling peoples or nations is that *Satiyaputo* and *Ketalaputo* are both singular in form. This is not wholly correct because in the *Mansehra* text, we have the names enumerated in a plural form : *Satiyaputra* and *Keralaputra*, *putra*=*putrā*. The correctness of the *Girnār* text, *ā Tambapannī*, is corroborated by all the copies of R.E. XIII. The singular form of the name, *Tambapannī*, *Tambapanni*, as met with in R.E. II, led Vincent A. Smith to treat it as the name of the river *Tāmrāparṇī*, and not as the name of the country of *Tāmrāparṇī*. But in R.E. XIII, the reading invariably gives a plural form : *Tambapaniye*, *Tambapanniyā*. Thus the names as enumerated in R.E. XIII stand mainly for peoples and by implication for a country. The same remark holds true of the *Mansehra* list as to R.E. II. Evidently *Ketalaputa* and *Satiyaputa* are place names like *Pāṭaliputta*, *Kesaputta* and *Seriyāputa* (*Barhut Inscriptions*), in which case the *Girnār* names stand for countries. The mention of *Tambapannī* as a river after *Satiyaputa* and *Keralaputa* is unlikely (*Raychaudhuri, Political History*, p. 274). But against this contention, it may be pointed out that in R.E. XIII, the people of *Tambapannī* are mentioned just after the *Pāṇḍyas*.

*Chodā* : The land of the Cholas or the Cholas as a people. From Aśoka's manner of introduction of the name, it is clear that Chola was then an independent country north, north-east of *Pāṇḍiya* or the land of the *Pāṇ-*



*dyas*. When Buddhadatta wrote his commentaries and manuals in about the 4th century A.D., *Chola* was a flourishing kingdom during the reign of king Achyutavikrānta or Achyutavikrama of the Kalabhra dynasty (*Kalambakulanandana*). Buddhadatta gives a highly patriotic account of it, describing it as an epitome of the entire earth. *Kāveripattana* was then its important inland port, and obviously the river *Kāverī* was its southern natural boundary. *Uragapura* (modern Uraiyur) on this river was the birth place of Buddhadatta (Buddhadatta's Manuals, Introduction, Nilakanta Sastri, *The Cholas*), according to the *Skanda-Purāṇa*, *Kāñchīpura* (modern Conjeeveram) was the capital of *Chola* in the days of Vishṇudāsa (Pali *Veṇhudāsa*, *Kaṇhadāsa*), a neo-Vaiṣṇava reformer described by Buddhadatta as his contemporary and benefactor. Buddhaghosa mentions *Kāñchīpura* as a seat of Buddhist learning without, however, any reference to *Chola* (*Manorathapūraṇī*, *nigamana* or concluding verses). It was from *Kāñchīpura* that he went over to *Tambapaṇṇidīpa* or Ceylon evidently *via Madhurasuttapattana* or *Madurā*, the capital of *Paṇḍya* (*Papañcha-sūdanī*, *nigamana*. B. C. Law, *Life and Works of Buddhaghosa*). That the *Chola* country was drained by the river *Kāverī* is equally borne out by the descriptions in some of the South Indian inscriptions (Hultzsch, *S.I.I.*, Vol. I, pp. 34). *Chola* was evidently *Ḍamilaraṭṭha* or Dravidian state, which, according to the *Akitti Jātaka*, (J. IV, p. 338), included *Kāvīrapattana*. The *Cholas* as a people were no other than those who are called *Kolakā* in the *Apadāna* (II, p. 258 f.). *Kolapattana* finds mention in the *Milindapañha* (p. 359) as a famous port, which was evidently situated in the sea-cost of *Cholamaṇḍala* or Coromandel. It is quite possible that *Kolapattana* itself was a regional name denoting the whole of the navigable sea-cost of *Chola* as it was then known. In that case the ancient *Chola* country must have been a large territory which extended along the Coromandel coast from the region of Pennar river (*Kṛishṇavenā?* Pali *Kaṇhapennā* *Jātaka*, V) in the north, if not from that of the Munyeru, to the *Kāverī* region in the south. On the authority of Ptolemy Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar has sought to prove (*Aśoka*, p. 41 f.) that at one time (i.e., during the reign of the Śātakarṇi ruler Pulumāyi, or during that of the Græco Bactrian king Eukratides) there were two *Chola* kingdoms, the northern with its capital at *Orthoura* (*Uragapura*), the royal city of the *Sornagas* identified by Cunningham with Uraiyur near Trichinopoly, and the northern with *Arkatos* identified by Caldwell with modern Arcot. *Chola* represented a monarchy when Buddhadatta and Buddhaghosa wrote and dwelt in South India. The latter, for instance, says : *Cholassa visayo Chola-visayo*, *Paṇḍassa visayo Paṇḍavisayo*, but *Savarānam visayo Savaravisayo*, *Papañchasūdanī*, Siamese Ed., III, p. 467. All that the edicts of Aśoka lead us to think is that the *Chola* country had at that time rather a republican or national than a monarchical form of government and that it lay at least to the south of the Karnool District of the Madras Presidency in which a set of fourteen rock edicts and a copy of M.R.E. have been found out at Yerragudi,



as well as the territory of the Andhras, to the east of Mysore (ancient *Mahim-sakaratt̥ha* or *Mahishamaṇḍala*), to the north, north-east of *Pāṇḍya*, and over the whole of the *Kāverī* region including modern Trichinopoly and Tanjore (Raychaudhuri, op. cit., p. 271).

*Pādā, Pāṇḍiya* : The land of the *Pāṇḍyas* or the *Pāṇḍyas* as a people. The grammarian Kātyāyana derives the name *Pāṇḍya* from *Pāṇḍu*, while in the two Pali Chronicles of Ceylon the *Pāṇḍyas* are invariably called *Pāṇḍus*. The latter speak of an early matrimonial alliance between the royal houses of *Pāṇḍya* and Ceylon, and refers to *Pāṇḍya* as the neighbouring kingdom from which guilds of artisans were brought over to Ceylon. Varāhamihira in his *Bṛihatsaṃhitā* (XVI. 10), speaks of *Uttara-Pāṇḍyas*, suggesting thereby that there were in his time two *Pāṇḍya* countries, northern and southern. But from this we are not to infer with Dr. Bhandarkar (*Asoka*, p. 45) that Varāhamihira alluded to the northern *Pāṇḍya* country in the far south of South India. Ptolemy (circa 150 A.D.), too, as pointed out by Dr. Raychaudhuri (*Political History*, p. 271 f.), speaks of the country of the *Pandouoi* (*Pāṇḍu*) in the Punjab, which is to say, in Northern India. Varāhamihira may have referred just to this northern country of the *Pāṇḍus* or *Pāṇḍyas*. Similarly when the *Ghata Jātaka* (*Jātaka*, IV), speaks of *Uttara-Madhurā*, the capital of *Sūrasena* and associates the early career of Vāsudeva Kaṇha and his nine brothers with it, it is to be understood that it meant to distinguish the northern *Madhurā* from the southern, which latter was the capital of *Pāṇḍya*, the southern *Pāṇḍya* country, the *Pāṇḍya* of Aśoka's edicts. There must have been some Indian legendary basis of the historical and ethnic connection between the *Pāṇḍus*, the *Sūrasenas* and the *Pāṇḍyas* as hinted at also 'in the confused stories narrated by Megasthenes regarding Herakles and Pandai' (Raychaudhuri, op. cit., p. 272). But it is not quite correct to say with Dr. Raychaudhuri that 'the *Pāṇḍus* are mentioned as the ruling race of *Indraprastha*, in the *Mahābhārata* as well as in several *Jātakas*'. As Dr. B. C. Law has recently and quite correctly pointed out (India as described in the early texts of Buddhism and Jainism), the Pali *Jātakas* do not connect the five sons of king *Pāṇḍu* with *Indraprastha* who married Kaṇhā (Kṛishṇā, a foster-daughter of the then king of Benares (*Jātaka*, V, p. 425 f.). Arjuna of the royal line of Yudhisṭhira who is represented as the most famous and righteous king of the *Kuru* country with *Indraprastha* as its capital (*Kurudhamma Jātaka*) has nothing to do with *Pāṇḍu*'s eldest son Arjuna. Even assuming that the *Pāṇḍyas* were originally a people of the *Pāṇḍu* stock, migrated to the far south of South India from Northern India, say *Uttara-Madhurā*, and founded a territory named *Pāṇḍya* after them, we cannot deny that the *Pāṇḍyas* as a people came to be counted among the *Damila* or Dravidian races and their dialect, too, became just a form of *Damila-bhāsā* or Dravidian speech. Buddhaghosa refers to southern *Madhurā* as a *sutta-paṭṭana* or port noted for export of cotton fabrics. (Papancha-sūdanī,



nigamana). In the Hāthigumphā inscription, too, the contemporary *Pāṇḍya* king (Paṇḍa-rājā) is said to have sent to king Khāravela of Kālīṅga valuable presents of gems, pearls, jewels and various kinds of apparel. This hardly leaves room for doubt that in about the 1st century B.C. or A.D. the *Pāṇḍya* country was being ruled by a king, while the edicts of Aśoka mention the *Pāṇḍyas* as a ruling people rather than one living under a monarchical form of government. As for the location of their country, it lay immediately to the south south west of *Chola*, above *Tāmraparṇī*, and to the east of the country of the *Satiyaputras* and *Keralaputras*. In the opinion of Dr. Raychaudhuri (*op. cit.*, p. 271), the *Pāṇḍya* country corresponded to the Madurā, Rāmnad and Tinnevely districts and perhaps the southern portion of the Travancore state, and had its capitals at Kolkai and Madurā (*Dakṣiṇa Mathurā*) and the rivers *Tāmraparṇī* and *Kṛitamālā* or Vaigai flowed through it. The correctness of this, however, depends on that of the location of Aśoka's *Tambapannī* and *Keralaputra*.

*Satiyaputa*, *Sātiyaputa*, *Satiyaputra*: This name is mentioned in the singular in all but the Mānsehra text and spelt *Satiya* in all but the Kālsi version where the spelling is *Sātiya*. In its singular form, it may be treated either as a place-name like *Seriyāputa*, *Kesaputta*, and *Pāṭaliputta*, or as name of the then reigning king whose territory, too, was called *Satiyaputra*, or simply *Satiya*, *Sātiya*, such as king Kālīṅga of *Kālīṅga* and Āssaka (Āśvaka) of *Assaka*. In its plural form it stands either as the name of a people or as that of their country. In the absence of the variant *Sacha*, just as we have *ekachā* (G) for *ekatiyā* in other texts (R.E. I), it is unsafe to equate *Satiya* with *Satya*. Accordingly one must reject all the suggestions proposing on this very equational basis to identify *Satiyaputra* as a country with (1) *Kāñchīpura* described as *Satyāvratashetra*, (2) the Tuluva country or the region round about Satyamangalam Tāluk of Coimbatore, (3) *Satyabhūmi* of the Kerolalpatti, corresponding roughly to North Malabar including a portion of Kasergode Tāluk, South Kānārā, and (4) Konganādu ruled by the Kosar people noted for their *satyavādītā* or truthfulness (Raychaudhuri, *op. cit.*, p. 272). Mr. M. G. Pai's identification of *Sātiya* or *Satiya* with *Sāntika* in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa and Bṛihat Saṁhitā, which latter included South Kānārā, still needs corroboration. Kirfel's identification of *Satiya* with *Satiya* mentioned in the Mahābhārata, Bhīṣmaparva, I. 63, along with *Mūshaka* among the southern countries as well as in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa (Wilson's Transl. II. p. 80) is rendered dubious by the variants, *Satīpa* and *Satīrtha*, as well as by the fact that in a similar context the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, Bhāratakhanda-varṇanā, calls it *Setuka*: *Setukā Mūshikāś chaiva Kumārā Vanavāsikā*. Bühler's identification of *Sātiyas* with *Sātvats* mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VIII. 14, is based only on a surmise. Still the best sug-



gestion on this point is one from R. G. Bhandarkar, drawing attention to the fact that along the westernmost portion of the Deccan tableland we have Marāṭhā, Kāyastha, and Brāhman families, bearing the surname 'Sātpute' which cannot but be treated as a modern transformation of Aśoka's *Satiyaputa*. On this basis the country of *Satiyaputa* is identified with the coastal region 'situated along the Western Ghāts and the Konkan Coast below' (Indian Review, 1909, p. 401 f.). On the same basis Dr. Aiyangar (J.R.A.S., 1919, p. 581 f.) treats *Satiyaputra* as a collective name of the various matriarchal communities like the Tulus and the Nayars of Malabar, and locates *Satiyaputra* as a country in the region north of Cochin. It is clear from Aśoka's mode of enumeration that he meant five independent allied countries that were situated in South India, to the south of his own *vijita*, and that the land of *Tambapannī* lay below *Pāṇḍya* and *Keralaputra*, in which case *Satiyaputra* must have stood north north-west of *Keralaputra* on the western side of the far south of South India just in the same way that *Chola* stood in relation to *Pāṇḍya*. From the location of Aśoka's Rock and Minor Rock Edicts, it may be inferred that the country of *Satiyaputra* or *Sātiyaputra* lay along the western coast of South India to the south of Sopārā (ancient *Suppāraka*, *Sūrpāraka*) and the Chitaldrug District of Mysore, to the west of Mysore and to the north of *Karalaputra*. Corresponding to the Aśokan list of the first four names, Ptolemy and the author of the Periplus mention *Limyrike*, *Aioi*, *Pandionī*, and *Soxetai*. Commenting on this datum, Dr. Bhandarkar (Aśoka, p. 45) observes: "the last two are the *Pāṇḍya* and *Choda* countries respectively. *Limyrike* is taken to be equivalent to *Damirike*, the greater portion of which, however, was subject to *Keralaputra*. . . . If *Andrakottos* is sometimes written for *Sandrakottos* and *Abiria* for *Sabiria*, can *Aioi* be really *Saioi* (=Satiya)? If this surmise is correct, the kingdom of *Satiyaputta* may be represented by modern Travancore." Corresponding to Aśoka's four names, the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa (Bhāratakhanda-varṇanā) speaks of the four countries of *Dakṣiṇāpatha*: *Pāṇḍya*, *Kerala*, *Chola* and *Kūlya*, each named after its people (*Pāṇḍyās cha Keralās chaiva Cholāḥ Kulyās tathaiḥ cha*). In the very next list we have mention of the *Setukas*, the *Mūshikas*, the *Kumāras*, and the *Vanavāsikas*. If it be assumed that the *Kūlya* of the first list were the same country as *Satiyaputra*, we may take the latter to be a coastal country. Bhaṭṭaswāmī, the commentator of the Arthaśāstra identifies *Kūla* with a river near the village Mayūra in the island of Sīmhala, while the Purāṇa definitely locates the *Kūlyas* in South India. The Mahābhārata, Sabhāparva, 31. 71, mentions the four peoples or countries in the manner of Ptolemy's geography and the Periplus: the *Pāṇḍyas*, the *Drāviḍas*, the *Chodas*, and the *Keralas* (*Pāṇḍyāms cha Drāviḍāms chaiva sahitāms Choḍa-Keralaiḥ*). The important point of difference between the two enumerations is that in the Epic list *Drāviḍas* (=Limyrike) takes the place of *Aioi* (Satiya), while in the other list the same stands for *Kerala*. The Rāmāyaṇa (iv. 41. 12)



speaks only of *Chola*, *Pāṇḍya* and *Kerala*. The southern boundary of *Pāṇḍya* is said to have been the river *Tāmraparṇī*.

Ketalaputa, Keralaputa, Keraḍaputra: The edicts of Aśoka enable us to locate *Keralaputra*, *Kerala* or *Chera* as a country west of *Pāṇḍya*, south south-east of *Satiyaputra*; it must have been situated along the western coast of South India. According to Dr. Bhandarkar (*Aśoka*, p. 45), this country must have once 'included South Canara, Coorg, Malabar, and north-west parts of Mysore with perhaps the northernmost portion of Travancore,' while Dr. S. K. Aiyangar would prefer to locate it in the region including Cochin and extending southwards therefrom. At the time when the *Periplus* was written *Mouziris* (= *Muyiri-kudu*) or modern Kranganur was the seat of government of *Cerobothra* (*Keralaputra*) which when Ptolemy wrote was in the interior at Karoura, that is, Karur on the Amarāvati in the Coimbatore District (*I.A.*, VIII, p. 145, XIII, p. 367 f.; Bhandarkar, *Aśoka*, p. 45 f.). Dr. Raychaudhuri upholds the view according to which *Keralaputra* or *Chera* is the country south of *Kūpaka* (or *Satya*), extending down to Kanneti in Central Travancore (Karunagapalli Tāluk, south of which lay the political division of *Mūshika* (*J.R.A.S.*, 1923, p. 413), and even goes so far as to specify that "it was watered by the river Periyar, perhaps identical with the *Chūrṇī* of the *Arthaśāstra* on the banks of which stood its capital *Vaṇḍi* (near Cochin) and at its mouth the seaport of *Muziris*" (*Political History*, p. 273). But the question still is—will all these opinions and suggestions, offered more or less on the authority of the *Periplus* and Ptolemy's Geography, hold water when we are dealing with Aśoka's *Keralaputra* which, according to his mode enumeration and specification, lay below *Satiyaputra*, above *Tāmraparṇī*, and to the west of *Pāṇḍya*? The state of things must have completely changed to reverse the relative territorial position of the *Satiyaputras* and the *Keralaputras* during the three or four centuries that followed. We have seen that *Limyrike* (*Damirike*, *Tamilakam*, *Drāviḍa*) which stands for *Kerala* in the list of four countries supplied by the *Periplus*, takes in one of the two Epic lists the place of *Kūlya* (i.e., of *Satiya* or *Sātiya*) in the other. Dr. Bhandarkar and Hultzsch treat *Keralaputra* in the singular as the name of then reigning king of *Kerala* which the latter identifies with Malabar.

ā Tāmbaparnī, avam Tāmbaparnīya: As far (south) as *Tāmraparṇī*, the land of the *Tāmraparṇis*. The name definitely occurs in the singular in all texts except G, while in R.E. XIII it is in the plural. In the former, it is located below *Pāṇḍya* and *Keralaputra*, and in the latter, below *Pāṇḍya*. In Brahmanical literature, *Tāmraparṇī* is the name of a river in South India or a region which is now represented by the Tinnevely District and Ceylon is usually designated *Simhala*, while in Pali literature, *Tāmbaparnī* is employed as a familiar name



of Ceylon, otherwise called Sihala and Laṅkā. Laṅkā or Pārasamudra (Arthaśāstra, Ch. XI; Greek *Palaesimundu*; Rāmāyaṇa VI. 3. 25 describing Laṅkā as *sthitā pāre samudrasya*; *Papañchasūdanī*, Siamese Ed., III, p. 503; *Pārasamuddavāsī thera*). It was perhaps to distinguish Tambapaṇṇi as Ceylon from Tāmrapaṇī or Tambapaṇṇi as river or riverine region that very frequently the word *dīpa*, *dvīpa*, 'island' is added to it. Even in one of the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscriptions (No. F) we read: "Vanavāsi-Yavana-Damila-Pālura-Tambapaṇṇi-dīpa-pasādakānaṁ Theriyānaṁ Tambapaṇṇinakānaṁ. In the absence of *dīpa* added to the name, the question remains whether by it was meant the country forming a region of the river Tāmrapaṇī in South India, or the island of Ceylon. Vincent A. Smith came at last (*Asoka*, 3rd Ed., p. 162) to take the name to mean not Ceylon but the river Tāmrapaṇī in Tinnevely. But Dr. Raychaudhuri prefers (*op. cit.*, p. 274) to take it to mean Ceylon on the ground that 'the expression Ketalaputo as far as the Tāmrapaṇī is hardly appropriate because the Tāmrapaṇī is a Pandyan river.' His objection cannot, however, be valid if one chooses, as one should, to take it to mean not the river as such but a region or country which was situated in the Tāmrapaṇī valley and immediately below Pāṇḍya. On Dr. Raychaudhuri's own showing (*op. cit.*, p. 541) Ptolemy speaks of the kingdom of the Karesi (Tāmrapaṇī valley) which evidently lay to the south south-west of the kingdom of Modoura or Pāṇḍya. Megasthenes (*Indika*, Frag. XII B. 17, XVIII) refers indeed to Taprobane (Tāmrapaṇī) as a large island in the sea separated from the mainland by a river, which he does not name and beautified by its palm-groves. Evidently he meant Ceylon, but here again he does not omit to describe it expressly as an 'island.' The Buddhist Chronicles of Ceylon, written in Pali and Sinhalese, speak definitely of a religious mission despatched by Aśoka to the island of Tāmrapaṇī during the reign of Devānampiya Tissa for the propagation of Buddhism there, and the tradition thereof is embodied even in a Pali Canonical work, the *Parivārapāṭha* which was compiled in about beginning of the Christian era. But this literary tradition should not create a bias in favour of Ceylon when we are dealing with Aśoka's edicts on their own strength.

4. *Am̐tiyoge nāma Yonalājā ye chā am̐ne tasā Am̐tiyagasā sāmāntā lājāno*: The Ionian king named Antiochus and those other (Ionian) kings who are his neighbours. R.E. XIII mentions by name Antiochus and four others (identified in its footnotes), viz., Ptolemy, Antigonas, Magas, and Alexander. There can be no gainsaying the fact that in both the contexts they represent the five neighbouring territories ruled severally by them, namely, Syria and Western Asia by the first, Egypt by the second, Cyrene in North Africa by the fourth, Macedonia by the third, and Epirus or Corinth by the fifth. The Pali word *Yona*, Sk. *Yauna* met with in the *Mahābhārata*, is derived evidently from Ionia, and the five Yonarājas of Aśoka's time were of Ionian or Greek origin.



✓5. *dve chikisā katā*: 'Two kinds of medical treatment were arranged for.' The Kalsi text has *chikisakā* (lit. medical men) instead of *chikisā* of other versions, but the enumeration of two kinds shows that the intended word is *chikisā*. What did Aśoka mean when he says that he arranged for or established two kinds of medical treatment? Did he actually mean that he founded dispensaries or hospitals, or that he simply gave an impetus to the founding of these humane institutions by supplying medicinal herbs, roots and fruits and causing them to be planted wherever these were not available? According to Dr. Bhandarkar (Asoka, p. 192 f.), 'Aśoka opened dispensaries for men and *pinjrapols* for animals,' and 'established farms attached to those institutions so that all medicines might be there for ready use,' while Bühler took *chikisā* to mean 'a hospital.' In the Amarakosha (Manushyavarga, 134), the word *chikitsā* has for its synonym *ruk-pratikriyā*, or remedy of a disease. Aśoka's action must have given a strong impetus to the founding of *ārogyasālā*, maternity homes, and veterinary hospitals in different parts of India, and in Ceylon and other Buddhist countries. But would it not be straining our imagination far beyond the text to suggest that Aśoka himself founded or caused to be founded such charitable institutions as dispensaries or hospitals for treatment of men and animals? Taking *dve chikisā katā* to be the *uddesa* (thesis) and the sequel the *niddesa* (elaboration), can it not also be reasonably suggested that all that Aśoka meant was a liberal supply of medicinal herbs, roots and fruits to two classes of medical men in each of the territories named and plantation of trees for that very purpose? The close parallel cited from the Mahābhārata is expressly an injunction to the pious rulers to procure the medicinal herbs, etc., and particularly four classes of medical specialists (*chaturvidhāms cha vaidyān*). We need not think of the laying out of special *bhaishajya* gardens, inasmuch as the Varāha Purāṇa recommends the planting on the roads or roadside of the trees of which the leaves, roots, barks, etc. are useful for medical purpose. In P.E. VII, we have mention of *nimsidhiyas* (resting places), *āpānas* (drinking places) and *ambāvadikyas* (mango-groves), and in the Queen's Edict, of mango-groves, *ālāmas* (pleasances), and *dānagahas* (almshouses), but nowhere specifically of *ārogyasālā* and *bhaishajya* gardens. Dr. Mookerji characteristically argues (Asoka, p. 132): "medical treatment implies the provision of (a) physicians (including those for animals, veterinary surgeons), (b) medicines, and (c) places equipped for treatment, i.e., hospitals. Thus all the three—men, materials, and place—are conveyed by the term. The supply of medicines depended upon special botanical gardens for their cultivation, and pharmaceutical works for their preparation." He observes further: "The evidence of the edict on Aśoka's supply of medical aid is echoed in the legends which trace the origin of this measure to the death of a monk for want of medicines whereupon Aśoka had four tanks filled with medicines at the four gates of the city, as related by Buddhaghosa (Samanta-pāsādikā, p. 306)." But the legend cited above does not



speak either of physicians or of medicines, but only of four stores at the four gates of Pāṭaliputra for free supply of *bhesajjas* or ingredients of medicines, which is exactly meant in R.E. II by the terms *osudhāni*, *mūlāni* and *phalāni*. Further, it assigns the initiation of this measure to Aśoka's 9th. regnal year, which really corresponds to the 12th year according to the edicts. The legend definitely states that Aśoka daily spent one lac for the purpose.

6. *maṅgesu lukhāni lopāpitāni udupānāni cha khānāpitāni paribhogāya pasu-munisānaṃ* : "Caused the trees to be planted on the roads and the *udapānas* excavated for the enjoyment of men and beasts." In addition to the arrangements made for two kinds of medical treatment, Aśoka mentions specifically in R.E. II just two other public works of a philanthropic nature, called *iṣṭāpūrttas* in the Brahmanical Law Books, viz., the planting of trees on the public roads and the excavation of the *udapānas* by the roadside for the enjoyment of men and beasts. The plantable trees, according to the Matsya Purāṇa, are those which provide shade, abound in flowers and bear (abundant) fruits for the enjoyment of all living beings, men, beasts, birds and the rest of animals ; and according to the Varāha Purāṇa, those which provide shade and resting-place for the travellers and perches for the birds, and which supply leaves, roots and barks for the preparation of medicines. These are aptly called *mārgastarus* or *mārgadrumas* in the Śārngadharapaddhati and poetically described. Typically these are the shade-trees keeping clear of dangerous animals, growing of themselves, and abounding in flowers or bearing fruits. They are typified in P.E. VII by the *nigoha* (Pali) *nigrodha*, Sk. *nyagrodha* or *vaṭa*) or banyan, the popular Indian adage being *chhāyāśreshṭhah vaṭah*. As hinted in P.E. VII, with the typical shade-tree were associated the drinking and resting-places, and had in their neighbourhood the wells, tanks, fruit-gardens, pleasancess, and the like. Buddhaghosa has rightly suggested that in a context like this, the word *udapāna* which stands for wells (*kūpa*) in particular, denotes the tanks, large and small, and such other easily available sources of drinking water in general.

As to R.E. III :—

1. *mayā idaṃ ānapitaṃ* : 'This is commanded by me.' In accordance with the prescription in the Arthaśāstra, the verbal expression *ājñāpayati* or the like is to be used in a royal writ when it contains an order specially meant for the officers. Such a writ is to be treated as an *ājñālekha*. In this sense, R.E. III, the Schism Pillar Edict as presented in the Kauśāmbī copy and the Minor Rock Edict as presented in the Brahmagiri and Yerragudi copies may be singled



out each as a piece of *ājñālekha*. But in the Siddāpura and Jaṅgarāmeswara copies of M.R.E., the character of the forwarding note is changed by the expression *hevaṃ āha* substituted for *ānapayati*. The clause, *ya cha kiṃchi mukhato ānapayāmi*, which occurs in the body of R.E. VI brings out the true character of a typical *ājñālekha*. At the same time R.E. VI is not entitled to this honour simply because of its containing the clause: *hevaṃ mayā ānapitam*, inasmuch as here *ānapitam* means no more than something authoritatively stated, declared or announced regarding Aśoka himself.

2. *Sarvata vijite*: Here Aśoka is concerned with official matters relating to his own dominions, and as such, the edict has nothing to do with the *aṃtas* or *pracham̐tas*.

3. *Yutā*: So far as the verbal correspondence goes, the *Yuta* is the same official designation as Pali *Rājāyutta* met with in the *Rājāvagga* of the Aṅguttara Nīkaya, Sk. *Rājāyukta* mentioned in the Mahābhārata, or simply *Yukta* described in the Manu-saṃhitā, the Rāmāyaṇa, and the Arthaśāstra. The Pali word is really *Rājāyutta*, which occurs as a variant and is accepted as true spelling by Buddhaghosa. The *Rājāyuttas* are taken by the Pali scholiast to be all royal officers carrying on administrative work in the districts. In the Arthaśāstra, the *Yuktas* (identified in the Commentary with the *Adhyakshas*) are distinguished from the *Upayuktas* (identified in the Commentary with the *Uttarādhyakshas*), *Āyuktas*, and *Viniuktas*, the last two classes being frequently mentioned in the Gupta inscriptions. Dr. Mookerji (Asoka, p. 133) treats the *Yuta* 'as a general term for government employees,' and cites in this connection the authority of the Arthaśāstra, II. 5, which connects the *Yuktas*, *Upayuktas*, and their subordinates (*Puruṣhas*) with all departments of government service (*sarvādhyakṣaṇeṣu yuktopayukta-tatpuruṣhānām*). Referring to the Arthaśāstra, Dr. Bhandarkar (Asoka, p. 57 f.) observes: "Kauṭilya speaks of both the *Yuktas* and their assistants the *Upayuktas*. Their duties, however, were of the same kind as described in two consecutive chapters, a careful reading of which leaves no doubt as to their being principally district treasury officers who managed the king's property, received and kept account of revenue and had power to spend where expense was likely to lead to an increase of revenue. The verse quoted about the *yuktas* by Dr. F. W. Thomas from the Mānava-dharmaśāstra confirms the idea. For Manu says that lost property when recovered, should remain in charge of the *Yuktas*. These officers were therefore in charge of the receipts of all revenue and property of the king. Curiously enough, the designations *Yukta* and *Upayukta* survived to a late period. Thus in a grant of the Rāshtrakūṭa king, Goviṇḍa IV,



dated Śaka 853 (=A.D. 930), mention is made of *Yuktaka* and *Upayuktaka* along with the officers, *Rāshtrapāti*, *Grāmakūṭa*, and *Mahattara* (E. I., VII, p. 39 f.). Instead of *Yukta* and *Upayukta* we sometimes have *Āyukta* and *Viniyukta*. Thus *Āyuktas* are mentioned in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription of Samudragupta as 'restoring the wealth of the various kings, conquered by the strength of his arms' (E.I. XV, p. 138)." Dr. Raychaudhuri (*op. cit.*, p. 265) points out that 'in the early post-Mauryan and Scythian Age *Āyuttas* appear as village officials (E.I., XV, Nos. 7, 138), while 'in the Gupta Age they (*Āyukta-purushāḥ*) figure as officers in charge of *Vishayas* or districts, and also as functionaries employed in restoring the wealth of conquered kings.' It is not, however, correct to say with Dr. Raychudhuri that the *Āyuktas* find mention only in the Kalinga (i.e., Separate Rock) edicts, the statement *desāyutike* (J) or *desāvutike* (Dh) *hosāma* (S.R.E. II) having nothing to do with them. The *Yuktas* as *Adhyakshas* in the Arthaśāstra consisted of the *Sāṅkhyakas* (computers), *Lekhakas* (scribes, writers), *Rūpadarśakas* (coin examiners, mint-officers), and *Nivigrāhakas* (receivers of statements of accounts) and the like, while the *Upayuktas* as *Uttarādhyakshas* in the same text were officers who supervised the work of the *Adhyakshas* using the elephants, horses, and carriages as their conveyances (*hastyaśvarathārohāḥ*). Accordingly the *Hathiyārohas*, *Kāruṇakas* (*Kāraṇikas*), and *Yūgyāchariyas* mentioned in the Yerragudi text of M.R.E. may be classed with the *Upayuktas* or *Uttarādhyakshas* of Kauṭilya. So far as R.E. III is concerned, I welcome the suggestion of Dr. F. W. Thomas (J.R.A.S., 1914, p. 391) that here the *Yuktas* must mean the subordinate secretariat staff, who accompanied the *Rajjukas* and *Prādesikas* on tour. I agree with Mr. S. N. Mitra (Indian Culture, I, p. 310) in thinking that the *Rajjukas* are a class of *Mahāmātras* belonging to the central government and the *Pradesikas*, a similar class of officials belonging to the provincial governments, but find it difficult to admit that the *Yuktas* are a general name for all *Mahāmātras* broadly distinguished as *Rajjukas* and *Prādesikas*. Hultsch brings us still nearer the truth when he suggests that the *Yuktas* are the 'secretaries employed for codifying royal orders in the office of the *Mahāmātras*.' S.R.E.I. leaves no room for doubt that class of *Mahāmātras* were sent forth on tour every five years by the king himself (*hakaṁ mahāmāte pañchasu pañchasu vasesu nikhāmayisāmi*), and a similar class of them were to be sent at least every three years by the viceroys (*nikhāmayisati hedisameva vagam, no cha atikāmayisati timni vasāni*). They are broadly distinguished as *lājavachanika mahāmātras* (S.R.E. II, J). Here indeed we are to be concerned also with the *yutas* as functionaries in *gaṇanā* (G) identified by Jayaswal with *gānanikya* in the Arthaśāstra, meaning as it does the accounts department. But Aśoka's *gaṇanā* need not be so construed, especially in view of the fact that in the Queen's Edict, the expressions *ganiyati* and *ganayathā* are employed in the sense of 'are counted,' 'have (them) counted, recorded,' and have nothing particularly to do with accounts in the strictest sense of the term. Here *gaṇanā* or *ganana* stands for recording in general



rather than the accounts department in particular. The concluding statement of R.E. III, is to this effect that the *yutas* were to have a clear instruction in detail from either the *Parisā* or *Pulisā* (Ye) as to the nature of formulation or drafting of the royal order determining, no doubt, the tour-programme of the *Rajjukas* and the *Prādeśikas*. The *Prādeśikas* are introduced by name only in R.E. III, while the *Rajjukas* find mention also in P.E. IV, P.E. VII, and M.R.E. (Ye). The *Rajjukas* as important officials figure prominently in at least two of the Sātavāhana inscriptions (Lüders' List Nos. 416, 1195). As Dr. Raychaudhuri points out (*op. cit.*, p. 263), the *Rajjukas* are associated with the *Yutas* in R.E. III and with the *Rāthikas* in M.R.E. (Ye). They are again associated with the *Pulisas* in P.E. IV and P.E. VII. In R.E. III, the *Rajjukas*, alike the *Prādeśikas*, are represented as officials whose duty it was to go forth on tours every five years for three distinct purposes as stated in the Girnār text or for two purposes as stated in the Dhāuli version. In addition to the usual administrative duties assigned to them, they were required to initiate the public works mentioned in R.E. II and imparting instructions in the principles of Aśoka's Dhamma. In P.E. VII, too, they are charged with the duty of propounding and promulgating Aśoka's Dhamma. In P.E. IV, they are not only set over many hundred thousands of men precisely as in P.E. VII, not only charged with the duties of promoting the welfare of all people under them, the *janas* and *jānapadas*, and expounding the principles of the Dhamma to them, but expected also to administer justice maintaining a uniform standard of law and equity, being granted the power of discretion in the matter of award of rewards and punishments, honours and penalties. Again in M.R.E. (Ye), they figure prominently as officials to whom the king's message to be proclaimed was directly communicated for broadcasting amongst all persons and officers concerned. In the extant Jātaka Commentary, the Kurudhamma Jātaka in its prose narration describes the *Rajjuka* of the Canonical text in *gāthā* as *Rajjuggāhaka amachcha*, and represents him as an important state-functionary actually engaged in conscientiously and accurately measuring a plot of land and thereby upholding the high moral tradition of the Kuru administration. As represented in the *gāthā* itself, *Rajjuka* as the designation of one of the most important functionaries of the state, compared to a good chariot in motion, is but a metaphorical term suggesting the idea that the *Rajjuka* as a functionary was to the state just as the rein-holder was to a moving chariot. This does not enable us to draw any definite inference as to the actual official duty or duties of the *Rajjukas*. Even from the prose representation, it cannot be concluded, as hitherto done by some of the scholars, that the *rajjukas* were by their main official function the surveyors of land; the measuring of land by the *rajjukas* might have been undertaken just as a part of their judicial duty, the administration of civil justice. In establishing a correspondence between the *Rajjuka* of the edicts and the *rajjuka* of the Jātaka, on the one hand, and a class of Indian magistrates called *agronomoi* by Strabo, on the other, Dr. Raychaudhuri (*op. cit.*,



p. 263) pointedly observes : "The measuring of the land connects those magistrates with the *Rajjuggāhaka amachcha* of the Jātakas, while the power of rewarding and punishing people connects them with the *Rajjukas* of Aśoka." Vincent A. Smith takes the *Rajjukas* as governors next below the rank of a viceroy.

As for the *Prādeśikas*, Senart, Kern and Bühler take them as local governors or local chiefs, while Vincent A. Smith represents them as district officers, and Hultsch draws a comparison with the *prādeśikeśvara* of Kalhaṇa (*Rājatarāṅginī*, IV. 126). Dr. F. W. Thomas, however, identifies them with the *Pradeshtris* who stood as intermediates between the *Samāhatṛi*, on the one hand, and the *Gopas*, *Sthānikas* and *Adhyakshas*, on the other, and whose main functions, as mentioned in the *Arthaśāstra*, consisted in the collection of taxes, administration of criminal justice, tracking of thieves, and controlling of the work of the superintendents and their subordinates (*adhyakshānām adhyaksha-purushānām cha niyamanam*). "The more probable view," according to Dr. Raychaudhuri (*op. cit.*, p. 264), is "that they correspond to the subordinate governors, the *Hyparchs* and *Meridarchs* of the Hellenistic kingdoms." Attention in this connection might also be drawn to the instance of the chieftain of Setavyā in Kośala, call Pāesi (*Prādeśi*) in the Jaina *Rāya-paseṇi*, and Pāyāsi (*Prayāsi*) in the Pali *Pāyāsi-Suttanta*, and described as a *Rājanya* in both.

I cannot but appreciate Mr. S. N. Mitra's method of throwing light on the relative position of the *Rajjukas* and *Prādeśikas* from the S.R.E. I, which, too, deals with the subject of *anusamyāna*, although in a slightly different manner. Here the high officials meant to go forth on tours of inspection are spoken of as *Mahāmātras* under the king and those occupying similar rank (*hedisameva vagam*) in the provinces under the viceroys. Both of them are bodily distinguished from other high officials as *Lājavachanikas* (S.R.E. I, J), which is to say, as *Lājavachanika-mahāmātā*, a designation met with in S.R.E. II (J).

Now, is it not a fact that the *Rajjukas* and *Prādeśikas* of R.E. III who are required to proceed on official tours of inspection are precisely the *Lājavachanikas* of S.R.E. I, both those directly under the king and those in the provinces placed under the viceroys, equally required to do the same? We find that in S.R.E. I, the *Mahāmātras* once introduced as *Nagala-viyohālaka* (Dh, J) are designated again *mahāmāta-nagalaka* (J), the *Nagalaka* or *Nagala-viyohālaka* of the edict corresponding to the *Nāgarika* of the *Arthaśāstra*. Though there is as yet no edict in which the term *Lājuka* in one version has for its variant *Lājavachanika* in another, from the equation established between the subject-matters of R.E. III and S.R.E. I, one may reasonably conclude that the *Lājukas* of the former are the responsible high officials represented as *Lājavachanikas* in the latter. The distinctive epithet *Lājavachanika* is not without its significance. They were evidently a special class of *Mahāmātras* to whom the royal orders or messages were communicated with express directions as to how to put them into execution or broadcast them within their respective



jurisdiction. Thus they were directly responsible to the king for good administration and faithful carrying out of royal orders in so far as the central government was concerned. As regards the provinces, the *Mahāmātras* occupying a similar rank were directly responsible to the viceroys, the *Kumāras* and *Ayaputas*. If the first-named be the *Rajjukas*, the second-named must be the *Prādeśikas*. Considered in this light, the *Rajjukas* mentioned in R.E. III, P.E. IV, P.E. VII, and Yerraguḍi copy of M.R.E. and the *Mahāmātra* mentioned in the Kauśāmbī copy of the Schism Pillar Edict must be counted as *Lājavachanika* (*Rajjukas*) directly responsible to the king, and the *Mahāmātras* at Isila mentioned in M.R.E. (Bra, Si), and those at Samāpā mentioned in S.R.E. II (J), *Lājavachanika* (*Prādeśikas*) directly responsible to the respective Viceroy, more accurately, the Viceroy and his ministers who, too, are designated *Mahāmātras*. Thus the *Lājavachanikas* appear to have functioned as governors, chief commissioners, commissioners according to variations in jurisdiction. Kauṭilya's *Chora-rajjuka* mentioned (Arthaśāstra, IV. 13) as an officer 'liable to make good the loss by theft within their jurisdiction to traders who had declared to him the value of their goods' has hardly anything in common with Aśoka's *Rajjuka*.

5. *anusamīyānam niyātu* : "proceed on tours of inspection." The word *ānusamīyāna* means 'circuit,' according to Kern and Bühler, and transfer, according to Jayaswal and V. A. Smith (Asoka, 3rd ed., p. 164). In the Epic expression, *pūṇyatīrthānusamīyānam* (Mbh. I. 2. 123), it means 'going forth,' 'going forth to holy places of pilgrimage' (Raychaudhuri, *op. cit.*, p. 278). The word is met with also in the Besarh Seal. Dr. Bhandarkar translates the inscription, *Vesāla-anusamīyāna-kaṭakāre*, 'from the touring camp of the Vesāli (officers),' while Mr. A. K. Bose (I.H.Q., 1933, p. 811) more convincingly interprets *anusamīyāna* in the sense of 'a court-house or a citadel,' and *kaṭakāre* in that of a 'a mat-maker.' Here in Aśoka's Edicts, the word *anusamīyāna* means rather circuit than a circuit-house, and more accurately a tour of inspection. Mr. Charan Das Chatterji draws attention to the Pali word *anusamīyāna* in the Vinaya Piṭaka which Buddhaghosa (Samanta-pāsādikā) explains as meaning "tato tato gantvā pachchavekkhanam, i.e., going here and there for purposes of inspection" (Mookerji, Aśoka, p. 125). But he supplies a still better reference from the Aṅguttara-Nikāya, I, p. 68, where we have the verbal form of *anusamīyāna* in the expression *pachchantime janapade anusaññātum*. Buddhaghosa explains it as meaning 'to go into (the frontier districts) to see to the construction of residences in the villages (*gāmāvāsa*), of public works (lit. bridges, *setu-atthāya*), halls and similar works (*sālādi*)' (Mookerji, *op. cit.*, p. 125). By the word *sālā* Buddhaghosa generally understands *dānasālā* (i.e., *dānagaha* of the Queen's Edict), e.g., *Papañcha-sūdanī, tasmim kira dese dānapatinam sālā honti*. There is nothing, however, to prevent us thinking that the *sālās* included also the *ārogya-sālā* or charitable dispensaries. Dr. Mookerji's



translation ignores an important clause, namely, *anusāsitum pi*, "also to do administrative work." The purposes of *anusamyāna* in a *janapada* stated by Buddhaghosa are precisely those for which it was ordained by Aśoka. According to Dr. Raychaudhuri, the *anusamyāna* as described in R.E. III 'was mainly intended for propaganda work,' and that in S.R.E. I 'was specially instituted for the checking of miscarriage of justice, arbitrary imprisonment, and torture in the outlying provincess (*op. cit.*, p. 278). But the purposes of *anusamyāna* as stated in R.E. III are these three : (1) initiating public works, (2) propounding the principles of Aśoka's Dhamma, and (3) doing administrative work. The same are substantially the purposes stated in S.R.E. I as well. Dr. Mookerji's interpretation of *anusamyāna* in the sense of going out on tour, 'each according to his turn (*annu*)' (Asoka p. 125), is untenable.

6. *pañchasu pañchasu vāsesu* : 'every five years,' 'quinquennially.' According to R.E. III, both the *Rajjukas* and the *Prādeśikas* were to go forth on official tours of inspection every five years. This general rule promulgated in this edict appears to have undergone a modification in S.R.E. I, to this extent at least that the five-year rule definitely applied to the *Lājavachanika mahāmātras* under the king, while the Princely Viceroys were required to see that the *Mahāmātras* of similar ranks under them had not exceeded three years (*na timni vasāni atikāmayisati*). Here the question arises—which of the two was modified later, the rule promulgated in R.E. III or that in S.R.E. I? In arguing for an earlier date of R.E. III, I argued in favour of the first alternative and opined that which was at first promulgated as a general rule had to be modified subsequently as regards its application to the provinces under the viceregal princes, and that to meet the changed political situation which arose there. On the other hand, in arguing for an earlier date of S.R.E. I, Dr. Mookerji argues (Asoka p. 123) that Aśoka's first conception of his scheme of quinquennial tours for his officers was fully elaborated in some of his Rock Edicts which are therefore later than these Kalinga Edicts' and opines (*op. cit.*, p. 124 f) that 'later, when R.E. III was issued, the rule was that this administrative tour or *anusamyāna* should be undertaken every five years in every province of the empire (*sarvata vijite mama*) without any exception. As against Dr. Mookerji's opinion, I may point out, first, that the actual placing of the two Separate Rock Edicts below the set of Rock Edicts with the utmost care to keep them distinct proves beyond doubt that these were engraved later; secondly, that if the *Kumāras* or Princely Viceroys mentioned in S.R.E. I be Aśoka's sons as distinguished from the Viceroy at Suvaṇṇagiri referred to as *Ayaputa* (M.R.E., Br., Si, Ja), it is difficult to think that his sons, if he had any at that time (*i.e.*, in the 12th, 13th or 14th regnal year), were grown up enough when the Rock Edicts were promulgated to be 'eligible by age for Viceroyalty' (to use Dr. Mookerji's own phrase); thirdly, that as regards the process of modification



of the rule, an analogy to the point may be drawn from the early Buddhist ecclesiastical history, according to which the earlier general Vinaya rule requiring at least ten members of the Fraternity to form the chapter competent to ordain a monk had to be modified subsequently and the number was reduced from ten to five for the regions outside the Middle Country where the work of conferring *upasampadā* was greatly hampered due to the fewness of the *bhikshus* available there ; and fourthly, that it is not precisely a fact that S.R.E. I sets forth the first conception of Aśoka's scheme of quinquennial tours. In S.R.E. I, Aśoka is just interested to state painfully certain unusual circumstances which led him to think of including 'the checking of miscarriage of justice, arbitrary imprisonment and torture' by the high officials concerned, especially in the provinces under the Viceroys in the tour programme of the *Lājavachanikas* originally intended for the purposes stated in R.E. III, and which led him also to think of modifying the earlier general rule as regards its application to official tours in those very provinces. The fact of Aśoka's adherence to the five year scheme is corroborated alike by the Buddhist tradition in the *Divyāvadāna*, p. 46 (*pañchavārshike paryavashite*) and the chronology of important works recorded by Aśoka.

7. *etāyeva athāya imāya dhammānusaṣṭiya yathā añāya pi kaṁmāya :* "for that very purpose, for this instruction in the principles of piety, just as well for doing other (administrative) duties." To avoid the confusion of reference to the object stated in the first clause, *etāyeva athāya*, the nature of the statement is appreciably changed in the Dhauli and Jaugadā texts so as to make it suit R.E. III, considered apart from R.E. II : *athā añnāye pi kaṁmane hevaṁ imāye dhammānusathīye*, "just as well for other duties, so for imparting this instruction in the principles of piety." I maintain that the first clause, *etāyeva athāya*, is introduced with reference to the public works mentioned in R.E. II, an interpretation which well accords with Buddhaghosa's enumeration of the purposes of official *anusambyāna*.

8. *mātari cha pitari cha susrūsā :* I prefer 'respectful attention' as a rendering of the word *susrūsā* to either 'obedience' or 'hearkening' hitherto suggested by other Aśokan scholars. The Aśokan word *susrūsā* is used in a much wider sense than mere obedience or hearkening, and it may be taken to convey the full meaning of the Buddhist *pachchupatṭhāna* or ministering, of which the following five modes are enumerated in the *Siṅgālovāda Suttanta*, *Dīgha Nikāya*, III, p. 189 : (1) properly supporting them, (2) performing the duties incumbent on them, (3) keeping up the lineage and tradition of the family, (4) making oneself worthy of the heritage, and (5) making offerings for their benefit when they are deceased (Mookerji's *Asoka*, p. 135, f.n. 2).



9. *mitra-saṁstuta-nātinam dānam*: According to the *Siṅgālovāda Sutta*, *dāna*, 'liberality' or 'generosity' is just the first mode of *pachchupatthāna* or 'serving,' in other words, of Aśoka's *saṁpaṭipati* or 'seemly behaviour' to friends, comrades, kinsmen, etc. (*mittāmachcha*), the remaining four being — 'courtesy' (*peyyavajja*), 'benevolence' (*atthachariyā*), 'treating them as one treats himself' (*saṁānattatā*), and 'being good as one's word' (*avisamvādanatā*). Cp. Mookerji, op. cit., p. 135, f.n. 3.

10. *bamhana-samaṇānam dānam*: Liberality to the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Śramaṇas*. Instead of *bamhana-samaṇānam*, we have in Ye *samana-bambhanānam*, to the *Śramaṇas* and the *Brāhmaṇas*, which is usually the case in the Pali texts. The *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Śramaṇas* or the *Śramaṇas* and the *Brāhmaṇas* were the two convenient terms to denote all the Indian *pravrajitas*, the *tāpasas* (hermits), *parivrājakas* (wanderers), and *Śramaṇas* (recluses), in short, the *religieux* who had renounced the wordly life of a householder. The expression *samaṇa-brāhmaṇa* may be interpreted, according to Buddhaghosa, either in a narrower sense to mean 'the Brahmin ascetics' (*Samaṇa ti pabbaj-jupagatā, Brāhmaṇa ti bhovādino, jātivasena brāhmaṇā*), or in a wider sense to mean the 'saintly personages' (*samitapāpa-vāhitapāpe samaṇa-brāhmaṇe*). The main characteristic of the life of the *Śramaṇas* and the *Brāhmaṇas* was that in theory as well as by ideal they were wholly dependent on public charity, food and other requisites supplied by the laity out of faith (*saddhadēyyāni bhojanāni*, *Dīgha-N.*, I, p. 6 f.). As in earlier times, so in the days of Aśoka they formed different sects or denominations (*nikāyā*), and actively or passively propagated the Indo-Aryan religion almost in all parts of his empire (R.E. XIII). As regards the *Brāhmaṇas*, they were not only the ascetics but also those who kept to household life, the *Purohitas*, *Ritviks*, *Lakkhana-pāṭhakas*, *Śrotriyas*, *Mahāśālas* or heads of Vedic institutions, and the like, all entitled to receive gifts from the kings and public. Here in R.E. III, Aśoka speaks of *dāna* to them, while in R.E. IV, he insists on *saṁmāpaṭipati*, 'seemly behaviour' and in R.E. XII, speaks of *dāna* and various other modes of honouring (*vividhā pūjā*), all of which are covered by the Pali word *pachchupatthāna*, 'serving,' 'ministering to.' Thus Dr. Mookerji aptly quotes (Aśoka, p. 135) the following injunction of the Buddha from the *Siṅgālovāda Sutta*: "In five ways should one minister to the *Samaṇas* and *Brāhmaṇas*: by friendliness (*mettena*) in act, speech, and mind, by keeping an open door for them (*anāvaṭa-dvāratāya*), and by supplying their temporal needs (*āmisānuppadānena*)."

11. *prāṇānam sādhu anārambho*: This is just another way of saying *pāṇesu sayamo sādhu* (R.E. IX, *Saṁyutta-N.* I, p. 21). Here *anārambho* or



non-killing is only a negative virtue, the positive virtue being *avihiṃsā*, which is explained by the Pali scholiasts as meaning 'compassion,' compassionate attitude of human heart' (*kāruṇṇa-bhāva*). Embracing both the aspects of this human virtue, the Buddha says about himself : *Pāṇātipātāṃ pahāya pāṇātipātā paṭivirato samaṇo Gotamo nihita-daṇḍo nihita-sattho lajji dayāpanno sabbapānabhūta-hitānukampī viharati* (Dīgha-N. I, p. 4). "Abandoning the act of killing, Gotama the Recluse who has wholly abstained from the destruction of life, laid down the cudgel and done away with the weapon, lives being considerate, full of compassion, and well-wisher of all living beings." Non-killing means not killing intentionally and not being a party to killing. According to the Buddha's pronouncement in the *Siṅgālovāda Suttanta*, a noble householder completely abandons the destruction of life which is the first of the four *hammakilesas* or sinful acts (Mookerji's *Asoka*, p. 135).

12. *apavyayatā apabhaṇḍatā sādhu* : A good idea of 'this moderation in spending or hoarding' may be formed, as suggested by Dr. Mookerji, from the Buddha's admonition in the *Siṅgālovāda Suttanta* on the whole duty of a noble householder. The Buddha enjoins that a man should divide his wealth into four portions, one portion only to be spent for the normal enjoyment of life, two portions to be invested in business, and one portion to be reserved and hoarded for providing against emergencies. The *Arthaśāstra*, as noted, speaks of the wisdom in spending according to one's income on the ground that spending much, if one's income is small, ruins man's fortune.

13. *Palisā pi yutāni gananasī ānapayisaṃti hetuvatā chā viyaṃjanate chā* :

In all but the Gīrnār copy, the fourth word is *gananasī* instead of *gaṇanāyam*. Mr. S. N. Mitra has good reasons to suggest that here *gaṇanāyam* or *gananasī* stands neither for Kauṭilya's *gāṇanikya* or Accounts department nor for the Secretariat, it being rather employed in the sense of formulating. But Hultsch himself took the word to mean the codification of royal orders. The Gīrnār editor has compelled us to treat R.E. IV apart from R.E. III, whereas the above statement which is the concluding statement of R.E. III, according to the Gīrnār editor, is only introductory to R.E. IV. The causative form of the verb *ānapayisaṃti* has in the present statement a double object, one *Yutāni*, the person, what about the other which must be the thing? There is nothing to indicate that the thing refers to the short message (*dhammānusathī*) contained



in R.E. III; it refers indeed to the same message conveyed through R.E. IV in letter and spirit, which is to say, in a more elaborate and effective form. It will be seen that the introductory clause *Devānaṃpiye hevaṃ āha* is wanting in R.E. IV. The occurrence of this or its substitute enables us to determine the chronology of the Rock Edicts :

- (1) R.E. I and R.E. II together.
- (2) R.E. III and R.E. IV together.
- (3) R.E. V alone.
- (4) R.E. VI, R.E. VII and R.E. VIII together.
- (5) R.E. IX and R.E. X together.
- (6) R.E. XI, R.E. XII, and R.E. XIII together.
- (7) R.E. XIV alone.

As regards the use of the verbal forms of *āñāpana*, we have, first, *idaṃ āñāpitam* in R.E. III, where *idaṃ* is in apposition with the main subject-matter of the edict; secondly, the same expression in R.E. VI, where *idaṃ* is in apposition with what immediately precedes or follows; thirdly, *dhammānusathini vividhāni āñāpitāni* in P.E. VII, where the single object is *dhammānuṣathini*; fourthly, *āñāpayati Kosambiya mahāmāta* in the Schism Pillar Edict (Kausāmbī), where the second object is the main subject-matter of the Edict; and sixthly, *se dāni janapadam āñāpayisati rāṭhikāni cha* in M.R.E. (Ye), where the second object is the matter which immediately follows. These may suffice to suggest that the second object of *āñāpayisanti* in R.E. III is the whole text of R.E. IV, in which case one should put a colon instead of a full stop after it. One is to understand that the engraved text of R.E. IV was the outcome of an elaborate formulation of it by the *Yuktas*.

The *Yuktas* were certainly the subordinate officers in the Secretariat required to prepare the final draft of the royal orders and messages engraved or not engraved. This they needed instructions from *Purushas* or the *Parishad* as to that particular work in letter and spirit (*hetuto cha vyamjanato cha*) so that nothing might go amiss. In the case of other officers or officials, all that they were expected to do in promulgating the king's ordinances and messages was simply to have copies prepared *verbatim* (*etinā cha vayanenā*, M.R.E., Ru; *etena viyamjanena*, Schism Pillar Edict, Sarnāth) from the draft supplied from the Imperial Secretariat for circulation.

But who actually were the immediate official superiors to instruct the *Yuktas* in the matter, the *Purushas* or the *Parishad*? The subject in K and Sh is *palisā pari(sha)*, although the intended verb is put in the plural, *anāpayisanti*, *anapeṣanti*, which would not certainly have been the case if the intended subject were *Palisā* instead of *Pulisā*. The learned editors at Girnār, Mansehra, Dhauli and Jaugaḍā put the verb



in the singular so as to make it tally with the singular subject *Parisā*. It was not the duty of the *Parishad*, as will be shown in connection with R.E. VI, to instruct the *Yuktas*. In P.E. IV, the *Purushas* are described as the official agents to faithfully communicate the king's wishes (*chhamdam*) to the *Rajjukas* directing them specifically as to how to execute them. They were evidently attached to the king as his Secretaries. There are again edicts in which the *Pulisā* figure as general official agents identical, according to Dr. Raychudhuri (Political History, p. 264), with the *Purushas* or *Rājapurushas* of the Arthaśāstra'.

As to R.E. IV :—

1. *atikātaṃ aṃtaraṃ bahūni vāsasatāni* : Lit. 'in the past, during many hundred years.' The same is somewhat differently expressed in P.E. V as *atikātaṃ aṃtaraṃ bhutapruvaṃ*, 'formerly, in the past.' These as met with in R.E. IV, R.E. V, and R.E. VI are only an indefinite (*aniyāmita*) way of indicating the state of things that existed in the past and through many ages. The reference is indeed to the long-continued regime of the former kings of India, as expressed in P.E. VII, and not particularly to that of Aśoka's immediate predecessors, his father and grandfather. The phrase was devised, no doubt, to heighten the importance of the various changes, major or minor, introduced by him in methods of administration or policies of the state.

2. *prāṇāraṃbho bhutānaṃ vihiṃsā* : The difference sought to be made out in Pali literature between the two terms purports to saying that *āraṃbha* means the actual act of killing or destruction, the physical manifestation of the *vadhaka-chetanā* or intention of killing, and *vihiṃsā*, the propensity to kill which is an immoral mental state. The same difference applies *mutatis mutandis* to *prāṇānaṃ anāraṃbha* and *bhūtānaṃ avihiṃsā*. Out of the four terms, *pāṇa*, *bhūta*, *jīva* and *satta*, systematically employed by the Ājīvikas and Jainas to denote the living beings and living things, the first three occur as synonymous in the edicts of Aśoka. In P.E. VII, the term *pāṇa* is used in a much wider sense to mean mainly human beings : *Lajūkā pi bahukesu pāna-sata-sahasasu āyatā*.

3. *bherīghoso aho dhammaghoso* : According to the standard translation, 'the reverberation of the war drums has become the reverberation of the Law.' Taking *aho* to be an interjectional form of emphasis, Dr. S. K. Aiyangar renders it (J.R.A.S., 1915, p. 521 ; I.A., 1915, p. 203) : (But now, in consequence of the



adoption of the *Dharma* (the law of morality) by Devānāmpriya Priyadarśin) 'the sound of the drum is lo ! but the sound of the Dharma.' In treating *aho* as an interjection instead of a verb equating with Pali *ahu*, 'became,' the difficulty is that there is no *aho* before *bherighoso*. In such an idiom, *aho* is invariably repeated. Instances are not wanting where *u* has changed into *o*, e.g. *tadopayā*, *tatopayā* (R.E. VIII)=Pali *tadupayā*. This, however, is a minor matter. It has so far been deduced from the above declaration that Aśoka turned a pacifist by abandoning all aggressive militarism. This is not at all correct in the sense that it cannot be deduced from the declaration itself which, when read with reference to the context, signifies something totally different. (Here the drum does not stand for the war-drum. Wickramasinghe is the first scholar to suggest that here the sound of the drum is intended to mean the inauguration of a religious festival. Now the evidence of the Jātakas cited in the footnote (*ante*, p. 16) amply proves it. {The sound of the drum symbolises the popular religious demonstration, and that of piety, the *dhammānusathi*. It was by means of moral instructions that Aśoka claims to have obtained results that could not be achieved by the age-old traditional method in the past, during many hundred years. In other words, here Aśoka's intention is to compare and contrast the effects of the two methods, one, the time-honoured method of popular religious demonstration, and the other, the new method of moral instructions adopted by him. {It is not a fact that Aśoka succeeded in converting the sound of drum into that of piety by a display of various celestial forms. Dr. Bhandarkar is mainly responsible for the bisection of the explanatory statement and its misconstruction. The first method is that which was tried by the former kings of India (to put it in the language of P.E. VII), and the second is that which was introduced by Aśoka himself. {The explanatory statement runs from *vimāna-darsanā* to *thaira-susrūsā* ; while the preceding one closes with *dhammaghoso*, the former being just an elaboration of the latter.)

4. *Vimāna-darsanā hasti-darsanā agikhamdhāni cha añāni cha divyāni rūpāni desayitpā janam* : Dr. Bhandarkar seeks to interpret the passage (Aśoka, p. 308) in the light of the stories in the Pali *Vimānavatthu* describing as it does the glorious and enviable life of joy and happiness in different heavenly abodes to which the persons living pious lives on earth are entitled after their death.

As gods or goddesses they figure in the *vimānas* or movable celestial mansions of various shapes and sizes, and grandeur, or on the back of the *hastins* or 'all-white celestial elephants,' shining in complexion resplendent like *agi* or *joti-khamdhas*, i.e., the sun, the moon, the stars, lightning or fire. Dr. Mookerji rightly points out (Aśoka, p. 137) that 'these blisses were objectively presented before the people as stimulous to virtuous life.' Although all the gods called *Kāmāvachara devas* and all the lower angels called *Rūpabrahmas* were en-



titled to be *vimānas* according to their ranks and status, the *Vaimānika devas* were particularly the gods of the world of the Thirty-three, i.e., of the heaven of Śakra or Indra. Similarly it may be shown that although the celestial elephants, either all-white or deep black, served as vehicles to all such gods and angels, the *Erāvāṇa* (Airāvata), the vehicle of Śakra, with his thirty-three heads was symbolical of the heaven of the Thirty-three gods. As for the elephants, Dr. Mookerji suggests (Asoka, p. 136) that they might be 'actual elephants in procession (instead of those for war) or figures of celestial elephants, the vehicles of the *Lokapālas*, or the white elephant symbolising the Buddha.' Here the symbolisation of the Buddha by the white elephant must be ruled out of order (*ante*, p. 17). The elephants may indeed be taken as symbolical of either the heaven of the four *Lokapālas* or *Mahārājas*, or that of Śakra, or even that of the *Rūpabrahmas*, particularly those of the *Mahārājas* and Śakra who were in the popular eye the heavenly prototypes of the earthly rulers according to their ranks and status. The term *agikhaṁdhāni* or *joti-khaṁdhāni* (Sh) is generally taken to mean "bonfires, fireworks or illuminations, or 'fiery' balls and other signs in the heavens." Hultsch aptly quotes (J.R.A.S., 1913, p. 652) *mahantā aggikhandhā* to signify the guardians of the quarters, Indra and Brahmā, appearing as great masses of fire (*aggikhandham viya*).' The ancient authorities cited (*ante*, p. 17) enable us to interpret the word *agikhaṁdhāni* or *jotikhaṁdhāni* in the sense of the sun, moon, stars, constellations, planets, comets, in short, heavenly luminaries belonging to the realm of the four *Lokapālas*. The sun, moon, stars, and the rest are distinctly called *divyamūrtis*. In the *Mahābhārata*, and *joisiyā devā*, shining gods, in the Jaina *Aupapātika Sūtra*. There is no difficulty in including the different forms of terrestrial fire, lightning which is an atmospheric phenomenon, and illumination in the list of *aggikhandas*. Dr. Bhandarkar takes the remaining expression *añāni cha divyāni rūpāni*, 'and such other celestial forms', to mean 'such vehicles (of the gods and goddesses) as celestial horses, ships, and so forth mentioned also in the *Vimānavatthu*, and on this point his interpretation carries much weight. The *Mahāli Sutta* (Dīgha-N. I, p. 152 f.) throws abundant light on the subject of 'celestial forms' (*dibbāni rūpāni*) and their visualisation. The Lichchhavi prince Sunakshatra said to his friend: *Yad agge aham Mahāli, Bhagavantam upanissāya viharissāmi na chiram tīni vassāni, dibbāni rūpāni passāmi piyarūpāni kāmupasaṁhītāni rajaniyāni, no cha kho dibbāni saddāni suṇāmi*. "It is not even three years, Mahāli, since I began to live taking the Blessed One for my guide, when I see the celestial forms, attractive, captivating and enchanting, but I am not hearing the celestial sounds (of like nature)." In accounting for his drawback, the Buddha wanted to impress on the mind of his interlocutor that a probationer who cultivated that form of religious practice (*samādhi-bhāvanā*) which entitled him to the vision of the celestial forms only, he was capable of seeing them in the four quarters, above, below, and across, and that there were other



higher visions and experiences for which one must cultivate further practices as prescribed. The religious practice on the part of Sunakshatra was evidently confined to the life of virtue and mental concentration within the sensuous realm of the lower heavens, and it did not reach beyond that. It is the glories of the anthropomorphic heaven of Indra and that of the regents of the four quarters with their sovereignty established over the visible universe or phenomenal world comprising the heaven, earth, and firmament that had an age-long fascination for popular mind. The practice of virtue and piety insisted on by Aśoka and his Indian predecessors was not meant for any further reward hereafter.

As regards the actual devices adopted for a popular display of the celestial forms, the edict under notice has nothing to say. The main device, as might be inferred from the Achchharā verses in the Saṃyutta Nikāya (I, p. 33) and the prescriptions in the Arthśāstra, was the *yātrā* or ceremonial procession organized on the pattern of royal procession to the pleasure garden (Sumaṅgala vilāsinī, I, p. 148 f.) composed of chariots, elephants, horses, ships, palanquins, drummers, singers, dancers, torch-bearers, actual or artificial, portable picture-galleries, and the like. The magical and hypnotic devices must also have been in requisition. Some idea of the ancient processions might be formed from the annual procession of the idol of Pareshnāth in Calcutta. The *Charaṇa-chitras* that were highly praised by the Buddha (Saṃyutta-N.) consisted, according to Buddhaghosa (Sāratthappakāsinī, Siamese Ed., II, p. 398) in pictures of happy and unhappy destinies of men after death with appropriate labels attached to them and shown in portable galleries (*koṭṭhakaṃ katvā tattha nānappa-kārā sugati-duggatiyo sampatti-vipattiyo likhāpetvā 'idaṃ kammaṃ katvā idaṃ paṭilabhati, idaṃ katvā idanti dassento*).

5. *putrā cha potrā cha prapotrā cha . . . āva savaṭa-kapā* : This is somewhat differently expressed thus in R.E. V : *mama putā cha potā cha param cha tena ya me apacham āva savaṭa-kapā*, 'my sons and grandsons and who will be my descendants after them until the commencement of the period of envelopment.' The same is shortened into the phrase *putāpapotike* (P.E. VII), *putapapotike* (Schism Pillar Edict, Sānchī) which again in its turn has for its synonym *chamdamasuliyike* (P.E. VII), *chamdamasuriyike* (Schism Pillar Edict, Sānchī). In other words, the king's desire was to make the thing long-enduring (*chirathitika*). The term *Savaṭa-kapa* was evidently adopted from the current Buddhist cosmology which spoke of the cycles of time as proceeding by repeated alternations between two great periods, namely, that of envelopment (*Samvaṭṭa-kappa*) and that of development (*Vivaṭṭa-kappa*).



### As to R. E. V :-

✓. *mayā bahu kalāṇaṃ kataṃ* : 'Many a good deed has been done by me.' This, as already suggested (*ante*, p. 24), is precisely an echo of the Bodhisattva's declaration in the Mahāsutasoma Jātaka (F. No. 537): *katā me kalyāṇā anekarūpā*, 'various good deeds have been done by me,' *kalyāṇā* being paraphrased in the gloss (Jātaka, V, p. 492) by *kalyāṇakammā*. The identity of the two claims is not merely verbal ; it touches the fundamentals of the popular religion inculcated through the Jātakas and those of the *Dhamma* promulgated by Aśoka through his edicts. The various good deeds claimed to have been achieved by the Bodhisattva consisted in (1) the performance on a grand scale of *dānamaya yajñas* (*yaññā yitthā ye vipulā*, cp. Digha-N. I, p. 142 f) (2) the serving of father and mother (*pitā cha mātā cha upatthitā*), (3) the rendering of service to kinsmen and friends (*ñātisu mittesu katā kārā*), (4) the offering of gifts to many a person in many forms to the full satisfaction of the *Śramaṇas* and *Brāhmaṇas* (*dinnaṃ dānaṃ bahudhā bahunnaṃ, santappitā samaṇā brāhmaṇā cha*), (5) the righteous ruling of a praiseworthy kingdom (*dhammena issariyaṃ pasattham*), and (6) the preparation for going to the next world without any cause for repentance (*ananutappaṃ paralokaṃ gamissaṃ*).

2. *pāpe hi nāma supadālaye* : Mr. S. N. Mitra suggests that here *supadālaye* is not an Optative, it being simply a case in apposition with *pāpe*. Thus it stands to *pāpe* in the same relation as *sukaram* to *pāpaṃ* in G and Sh. I concur with his view for a twofold reason ; (1) that such a form of the Optative is nowhere met with in Aśoka's inscriptions, and (2) that the construction yields a better sense, as I construe it, enabling the two variants to convey the same meaning.

✓8. *Dharmamahāmātā* : The *Dharmamahāmātras*. According to Buddhaghosa, *mahāmatta*=*mahā amachcha*. V. A. Smith observes (Oxford History of India, p. 106): "About the time of the promulgation of the Fourteen Rock Edicts the emperor created a new class of ministers called *Dharma-mahāmātras*, whose title may be rendered by the term Censors. They received instructions to enforce the Law of Duty or Piety (*dharma*) among people of all religions and ranks including even members of the royal family." They were first appointed in Aśoka's thirteenth regnal year. They were required to discharge the following duties :—

(1) In connection with all religious sects : (a) to establish the 'norm' effecting an increase in virtue and to work for the welfare and happiness of



the virtuous amongst them (R.E. V); (b) to encourage the true spirit of tolerance enabling them to intelligently appreciate one another's faith and point of view and work together in harmony and concord for growth in the essence of the thing (R.E. XIII); and (c) to equitably distribute royal favour and do various other kinds of business as necessity arose (P.E. VII);

(2) in connection with royal family and members of the royal family, including his brothers, sisters, and other kith and kin : (a) to distribute charity ; (b) to found permanent institutions of piety ; (c) to satisfy their religious hankering for knowledge of the truth and the law of duty (R.E. V and P.E. VII); and (d) to persuade them to honour and help all sects of religion (R.E. XIII);

(3) in connection with the inhabitants of Yona, Kamboja, Gandhāra, Rishika, Ptenika, and other western peoples, as well as the old and destitute, begarrly Brahmins and ascetics, and slaves and servants : (a) to work for their good and happiness (R.E. V and P.E. VII); and (b) to protect those who are devoted to religion against harassment and molestation (R.E. V); and

(4) in connection with the jail administration : (a) to provide one bound in chains with ransom, (b) to protect him against molestation, or (c) to grant his release in certain special and extraordinary circumstances (R.E. V).

Here the important question is—whether or no, any exact correspondence may be established between Aśoka's *Dharmamahāmātras* and the *Dhamasthas* of the Arthaśāstra. The *Dharmasthas* were by their main functions Judges administering justice, both civil and criminal, while the *Pradeshtṛis*, with whom the *Dharmasthas* had some duties in common, functioned as Magistrates. The *Dharmamahāmātras*, on the other hand, do not appear to have any such judicial function. There is not the slightest suggestion in the edicts to warrant the surmise that they interfered with the usual course of justice. The question of treatment with mercy, sympathy or leniency of persons shut up behind the prison bars came indeed within their province. The only point of similarity between a *Dharmastha* and a *Dharmamahāmātra* is that the former, too, had the authority to treat with mercy a *tīrthakara* (founder of a school of thought), an ascetic (*tapasvin*), a diseased person, one who is wearied due to hunger and thirst or invalid due to old age (*lit.* tired due to long journey), one who has come from another country, one who has already suffered much from punishment, and one who is penniless, but that again only in the capacity of a Judge. The *Dharmamahāmātras*, on the contrary, figure prominently as royal almoners, dispensers of royal mercy, and, above all, as helpers of the cause of religion in general. There is indeed much truth in the suggestion that the functions of the *Dharmasthas* as Supreme Judges are relegated in the edicts of Aśoka to the *Rajjukas* (P.E. IV).



4. *savapāsaṁdesu* : 'among all sects, all denominations.' Here the term *pāsaṁḍa* is not used in a derogatory sense to mean 'a heretic.' The variant *prashṁḍa* (Sh) shows that it is just a phonetic corruption of Sk. *pārshada*. R.E. XIII employs *nikāyā* as another term to denote sects or denominations ; the term *nikāya* literally means a distinct body, group order, or class (Barua & Sinha, Barhut Inscriptions). In R.E. VII, the king desired to see all sects dwell everywhere, in all parts of his empire, if not in all parts of the earth. In R.E. XII as well as P.E. VII, they are broadly distinguished as *pravrajitas* or those renounced wordly life and passed out of common social environment, and *grihasthas* or those who kept to the normal life of a householder. The Aśokan scholars have so far made a mistake in treating the *grihasthas* apart from the *pāshaṁḍas*, especially in view of the fact that R.E. XIII distinctly speaks of *grihastha pāshaṁḍas* (*prashamḍa grahatha*). Further, in R.E. XIII, the *pravrajitas* are broadly distinguished as *Brāhmaṇas*. In P.E. VII, the *Samghasthas* (those belonging to the Buddhist Order), the *Nirgranthas* (those belonging to the Jaina Order) and the *Brāhmaṇas* and *Ājīvikas* find mention as notable representatives of the *pravrajitas*. The *Ājīvikas* prominently figure also in the three Barābar Hill-cave Inscriptions as recipients of the cave-dwellings in the Khalatika set of hills. As regards the *grihastha pāshaṁḍas*, there is not much in the edicts to guide us in the matter. In the Bhābru Edict, the householders are introduced only in their rôle as lay worshippers of the Buddha and lay supporters of those who were ordained as monks and nuns, and as such, belonged to the Buddhist Order. And in R.E. XIII, too, they are spoken of only as lay adherents of this or that sect or school of the *Brāhmaṇas* and *Śramaṇas*. In P.E. VII, Aśoka appears to be at the pains of suggesting that the *Samghaṭas*, *Nigamṭhas*, *Bābhanas* and *Ājīvikas* who are mentioned by name did not exhaust the list, there having been various other sects as well, the sects whose names are left to be understood. According to the contemporary and earlier Indian literature, the *pravrajitas* were represented by the *Tāpasas* or Hermits, *Jaṭilas* or matted-hair Vedic ascetics, *Brāhmaṇa Parivrājakas* broadly distinguished as *ekadaṇḍins* and *tridaṇḍins*, *Śramaṇas* or Recluses typified by the *Ājīvikas*, *Nigranthas* and *Sākyaputṛīyas*. Each of them formed various religious orders and schools of thought. The *Tāpasas* who lived in hermitages with their wives and children or their resident pupils were in one sense or another semi-householders. The Brahmins as householders figured and functioned as *Mahāsālas* or heads of Vedic institutions, or as *Purohitas*, or as *Yājakas*, and were entitled in all of these capacities to officiate as priests, especially at sacrifices. The masses of people who are aptly described as *Devadhārmikas* by the Buddha are said to have formed different groups (*vargas*) of devotees (*vratikas*), the devotees of Vāsudeva, those of Baladeva, those of Pūrṇabhadra, those of Maṇibhadra, those of the Sun, the Moon, the Stars, the Quarters, and the like (Pali English Dictionary, *sub voce* Devatā). Pāṇini in his aphorism, iv. 3. 97, speaks of the *Vāsudevakas* and *Arjunakas* as two differ-



ent sects of votaries, one pāying worship to Vāsudeva and the other to Arjuna (*Vāsudeva-Arjunābhyām vun*). These popular sects of *Bhakti* cult fully deserved the title of *pāṣaṇḍa grihasthas*. In the Pali phrase *gihi-pabbajitā* or *gahaṭṭhā pabbajitā*, the first term *gihi* means the unordained and the second term the ordained adherents of one and the same religion.

5. *dhāmādhistānāya, dhammādhithānāye* : V. A. Smith takes it to mean 'to enforce the Law of Duty or Piety.' Evidently it conveys almost the same sense as the expression *dharma-saṁsthāpanarthāya* of the *Bhagavadgītā* (iv. 8). But as employed in the *Nettipakaraṇa*, the term *dhammādhittāna* signifies the inculcation of the doctrine in abstract terms, while its antithesis *sattādhittāna* means the inculcation of the same in personal terms. This technical meaning of the term is not applicable to the Aśokan context.

6. *dhammavaḍḍhiyā* : In Pali, the word *dhammavuddhi* (*Aṅguttara-N.* I, p. 79) is expounded by Buddhaghosa as *dhammena vuddhi, na āmisena*, "the growth by conformation to the principle of right thought, right speech and right action, and not by the possession of earthly goods." Though by the word *dhamma* Aśoka, too, thought of conformation to these three principles, with him the *dhamma* was in its main aspect the Law of Duty or Piety as suggested by V. A. Smith.

7. *hitasukhāye dhammayutasa, dhammayutānaṁ aparigodhāya* : *Lit.*, 'for the welfare and happiness of one who is devoted to the *dhamma*, for nonharassment of the virtuous.' The two expressions of Aśoka, taken together, bear the full import of the single expression *paritrāṇāya sādhuṇāṁ* which occurs in the *Bhagavadgītā* (iv. 8). As regards the second expression of Aśoka, the variant in Ye, K, and Dh is *dhammayutāye apalibodhāye* and it means 'lawful freedom of movement and freedom of action.'

8. *Yona-Kamboja-Gāndhārānaṁ* : The same as to say *Yona-Kamboja-Gāndhālesu*, "among the Yaunas, Kāmbojas and Gāndhāras," that is to say, in the countries of Yona, Kamboja and Gandhāra that derived their names from their ruling peoples, the Yaunas, Kāmbojas and Gāndhāras respectively. As peoples they are grouped in the same way in the *Mahābhārata* (XII. 207. 43) and placed together with the Kirātas and Barbaras in the same North-western region of India, the Uttarāpatha (*Raychaudhuri, op. cit.*, p. 50). The list in the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* (Ch. 57) contains still more names of peoples and refers them all to Udīchya, which is just another name for the Uttarāpatha division. The *Purāṇa* list counts a people called Aparāntas among the Udīchyas, the ~~Aparānta~~ division. The *Apadāna* offers us a similar but earlier list of names (*B. C. Law, India as described*, p. 66 f.). One Pali stock list of the



sixteen great countries or peoples (Aṅguttara, I, p. 213; iv, pp. 252, 256, 260), mentions Kamboja after Gandhāra, while another list (Chullaniddesa) substitutes Yona for Gandhāra. In the Assalāyana-Sutta (Majjhima, II, p. 149), Yona and Kamboja are grouped precisely as in R.E. XIII. Manu (X.44) describes the Kāmbojas and Yavanas as *kshatriya* tribes or 'ruling peoples' who occupied 'the position of a fallen caste,' of the *Vrātyas*. The Śālveyas and Gāndhāras find mention in one Sūtra of Pāṇini (iv. 1. 169) and the Kāmbojas in another (iv. 1. 175), while a feminine form of Yavana, *Yavanāni*, occurs in the aphorism, (iv. 1. 49.) Jayaswal opines (Hindu Polity, I, p. 145) that R.E. XIII has substituted the *Nābhakas* and the *Nābhapaṃktis* in place of the Gāndhāras grouped in R.E. V, with the Yaunas and Kāmbojas, which is far from being the case. Obviously R.E. XIII has introduced two new pairs of names, one to go along with the Yaunas and Kāmbojas and the other, with the Ristikas and Petenikas.

The Assalāyana-Sutta mentions Yona and Kamboja as two typical frontier countries where altogether a different social order, an order other than one based on the *Chāturvarṇya* system prevailed. By the term 'frontier countries' (*pachchantimā janapadā*) were meant the countries or localities beyond the territorial limit of the Middle Country as known to the Buddhists of that age. The list of frontier countries is not meant to be exhausted by Yona and Kamboja, there having been other such countries and peoples (*aññesu cha pachchantimesu janapadesu*). So we need not be astonished when the Mahābhārata, the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, the Apadāna, and other texts associate other peoples with the Yaunas, Kāmbojas and Gāndhāras. R.E. V, includes them in the list of *aparāntas*, not meaning it to be exhaustive with five names given. The list is made somewhat fuller in R.E. XIII, with the addition of two pairs of new names. No other fact than this is to be deduced from the Aśoka clause *ye vāpi amne aparātā*.

Senart takes *aparātā* (Aparāntas) as a general term for the outlying provinces enumerated in a definite order in R.E. XIII, and he is justified in this respect by Dr. Bhandarkar (*op. cit.*, p. 33). According to Jayaswal, "*aparāntas* can mean literally two things: (1) the neighbours of the west, or (2) the hinder neighbours,—the states on the frontiers of Western India, or states inside. If we take *aparāntas* in its latter sense, it may simply mean Western End or Frontier of the Country, i.e., Western India. The Bhojas and Rāshṭrikas and presumably the Pitinikas did belong to the country called Aparānta, or Western India. But by no license the Yaunas and the Kāmbojas who were in Afghanistan, can be called *aparāntas* in the sense of Westerners. That region is always called 'the North' in ancient Indian literature. Nor could the Gāndhāras be called 'Westerners.' They were always counted in the North (Udichi, Uttarāpatha) . . . . . The first meaning of *aparāntas* being inadmissible, we must take the other one, 'states inside' (the home neighbours, ruling *Vishayas* of Aśoka)." I differ. Buddhaghosa records a tradition (Papañcha-sūdanī), according to



which that part of India (Jambudvīpa) where men coming originally from the Aparagoyāna or Western Continent settled down, acquired the name of *Aparānta janapada* (*Aparagoyānato āgatamanussehi āvasitappadeso Aparanta-janapado ti nāmaṃ labhi*). The Aparagoyāna or Aparagodāna represented that western division of the earth which not only lay to the west of Sumeru and Jambudvīpa, the Southern Continent, but extended as far west as the western seas and ocean. The suggestion has nothing but ingenuity to commend itself. It is easy to think that the peoples like the Yaunas came originally from the Western Continent, but what about the Ristikas and Pitenikas, the Andhras and Pārindas who, too, are called *aparāntas*? The more reasonable and consistent explanation cannot but be this, that the term *aparānta*, as distinguished from *pūrvānta*, denoted the western end or terminus of a trade-route by land. The Suttanipāta (Bk. V, Vatthugāthā) speaks of a great trade-route extending from Rājagaha, the capital of Magadha, to Patitthāna (Paithān) at the source of the Gādāvarī. The early texts of Buddhism speak of another such trade-route which starting from Sāvattthi or Kosambi extended as far west northwest as Sindhu-Sovira and Takshaṣilā, the capital of Gandhāra. At several points they were joined with branch routes leading to various destinations. From the meeting place of the two routes, the route which proceeded in a western direction towards the north-western region deserved the name of *Uttarāpatha*, and that which proceeded in a southerly direction towards the south-western region deserved the name of *Dakkhiṇāpatha*, and originally these routes lent their names to the regions across which they lay. The countries that were situated near about the western end of the North-western route were called *aparāntas* in relation thereto, and those near about the western end of the South-western route were also called *aparāntas* in relation thereto. As for the *aparānta* countries in relation to the North-western route, the Apanṇaka Jātaka (F. No. I) enables us to define them as various localities that lay beyond the western or north-western border of the desert of Rajputānā, and the *Pūrvānta* countries as various localities that lay beyond the eastern or south-eastern border of the same wilderness. Thus we read in this Jātaka : *Atīte Kāsīratthe . . . Bodhisatto satthavāhakūle patisandhim gahetvā . . . pañchahi sakaṭasatehi vaṇijjam karonto . . . kadāchi pubbantato aparantaṃ gachchhati, kadāchi aparantato pubbantam agachchhati*. Here by the term *pubbanta* is meant the city of Benares, and by *aparanta* the places reachable after crossing the *kantāras* or wildernesses constituting the great desert of Rajputānā.

The Yaunas, Kāmbojas and Gāndhāras were three typical *aparānta* peoples near about Takshaṣilā which was the terminus of the North-western trade route. They represented three tribal states in the province of Gandhāra placed under Aśoka's Viceroy-in-Council. They enjoyed some degree of independence as regards the administration of their internal affairs within Aśoka's empire (*rāja-visavasi*). Aśoka mentions them, first, in connection with the official duties of the *Dharmamahāmātras* (R.E. V), secondly, in connexion with the account of



*dhammavijaya* (R.E. XIII); and thirdly, in connexion with the account of the extent of Aryanisation or Hinduisation of India by the various orders of *Brāhmaṇas* and *Śramaṇas*. The context is really one and the same, and it is the vigorous religious propaganda started on state backing and its results within Aśoka's empire. The express mention of them by name must have been due to special reasons which are not far to seek. First, the Assalāyana-Sutta definitely speaks of them as peoples who had altogether a different social organisation admitting of nothing but a general distinction between the status of a master (*ayya*, *ārya*) and that of a slave or servant (*dāsa*), creating no impassable barrier between the two, and thereby making it possible for men to pass from one class into another according to opportunities and vicissitudes of life (*dve vaṇṇā, ayyo ch'eva dāso cha; ayyo hutvā dāso hoti, dāso hutvā ayyo hoti*). Buddhaghosa's explanation of this fact stated in the clearest possible terms is not only fantastic but coloured as well by sectarian prejudice. But he seems right when he points out that the social organisation among the Yaunas, Kāmbojas, and other allied frontier peoples was typically Persian (*Pārasaka-vaṇṇa*). From this point of view they were really one and the same people.

Secondly, though R.E. XIII singles out the Yonas as the only people in whose zone in the whole of Aśoka's empire the preachers of the Indo-Aryan religion, the *Brāhmaṇas* and *Śramaṇas*, had not obtained a foothold up till the time of its promulgation, going by their association with similar other peoples in the *aparānta* or North-western India, one can say that such was practically the case with the tribal zones of the Kāmbojas, Gāndhāras, and others. As regards the Kāmbojas, Dr. Raychaudhuri inclines to think (*op. cit.*, p. 126) as if they, once an Aryan people, came afterwards, even in the time of Yāska, 'to be regarded as a people distinct from the Aryans of the interior of India, speaking a different dialect.' The Assalāyana-sutta does not recognise 'the presence of Āryas (*Ayyo*) in Kamboja,' here the term *ayya* signifying only the status of a master as distinguished from that of a slave or servant (*dāsa*). There might have been, and it may be conceded—there actually were—a few centres of Brahmanic learning, and for the matter of that, some Brahmin settlements in the country called Kamboja, but that does not mean that Kāmbojas or the main people of Kamboja were in any early period regarded as Aryans. The evidence of the Bhūridatta Jātaka aptly cited by him goes against his opinion. In this Jātaka, the majority of the people of Kamboja, and not all of them, are credited only with barbarous habits and false creed giving sanction as it did to the killing of worms, insects, animalculæ, flies, snakes, and frogs as accredited means of the purification of self :

*Kītā pataṅgā uragā cha bheṅgā  
hantvā kimī sujjhati makkhikā cha,  
ete hi dhammā anariyarūpā  
Kambojakānaṃ vitathā bahunnaṃ,*



But this does in no way lessen the weight of his observation: "In the Mahābhārata (I. 67. 32; II. 4. 22; V. 165. 1-3) the Kāmbojas are represented as living under a monarchical constitution. . . . In later times the monarchy gave place to a new *Saṅgha* form of government. The Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra (XI. 1. 150) mentions the Kāmbojas (Kāmbhojas) as an illustration of a *vārtā-śāstropajīvin saṅgha*, that is to say, a corporation of agriculturists, *herdsmen*, traders and warriors."

The same remark holds substantially true of the Gāndhāras ~~or Gandharvas~~. The original or earlier home of the Kāmbojas called Paramakamboja is located by the Great Epic (II. 27. 25) somewhere in the outer Himalayan region which lay to the north-east of Kamboja and beyond the settlements of some predatory hill-tribes. Similarly the Mahāniddesa speaks of Yona as well as Paramayona as places to which the merchants went for trade, but is silent about their location. The name of the Yaunas was evidently derived from Ionia, and the main trend of opinion of the Aśokan scholars favours the theory of formation and existence of an Ionian Greek settlement or colony on the north-west frontier of India beyond the Indus, beyond the Hindukush mountain not only before the invasion of Persia and India by Alexander the Great but also before the advent of the Buddha and the time of Pāṇini. As there were the upper Indus settlements of the Kāmbojas (Kāmbhojas) and Gāndhāras, so there were the *trans*-Indus and *trans*-Hindukush settlements of these ruling peoples, the latter having been distinguished by the adjective *parama*. Jayaswal observes: "These Yavanas could not be referred to the town of Alexandria founded by Alexander in the Caucasus. That was never a self-governing unit, and the Macedonian element of invalid soldiers, who were anxious to leave the place, was too small and would have availed themselves of the death of Alexander to migrate. On the other hand, we have positive evidence of the existence of a Greek community on the Kubhā or Kabul river who had been there for a long time before Alexander's invasion. . . . These were probably Perso-Greeks, Greeks or Ionians who had moved and immigrated under the suzerainty of the Persian empire. The name of their city, Nysa, is a strong evidence of their Persian connection. They had been Hinduised, Alexander's companions first regarded them as Indians . . . the Nysians claimed to have been of Greek origin. They knew their Greek gods and Greek mythology and tradition (Arrian, Indika, I) . . . Alexander's companions were convinced of the ethnic claim of the Akoubhis and they passed ten days in Hellenic revels with them." (Hindu Polity, I, p. 147 f.).

Arrian, on whose account Jayaswal places so much reliance, is himself very sceptical about the historical foundation of the stories concerning Dionysos, his wars against the Indians, and the building by him of the city of Nysa on the Kābul river (modern Kamboh). His observation remains nevertheless substantially correct, especially when he suggests that there had existed somewhere on



the Kābul river a Persianised Greek settlement or 'colony' prior to Alexander's invasion of India. Pāṇini certifies the correctness of *Yavanānī* as a feminine form of *Yavana*, while Kātyāyana and Patañjali distinguish between the two feminine forms, *Yavanī* and *Yavanānī*, with which they were familiar, the first being applicable to a Yavana woman and the second to a form of alphabet (*Yavanah lipyām*). The prevalence of the Greek alphabet among the Yaunas and their neighbours within Aśoka's empire is still doubtful. The inscriptions through which Aśoka sought to make his edicts known to these peoples are invariably in Kharoshthī. Only one inscription of this age has been found at Taxila in a different script, but that, too, is not Greek; it is found to be Aramaic. In the opinion of Dr. Bhandarkar (Aśoka, p. 31), "there can be no doubt that it was on account of the enterprising spirit displayed by the Ionians that the Persians coined the word Yauna as a generic name for all Greeks."

Jayaswal locates the Yaunas as a ruling people in the city of Nysa which is identified by M. de St.-Martin with the modern village of Nysatta 'near the northern bank of the river of Kabul at less than two leagues below Hashtnagar,' while Dr. Bhandarkar places the pre-Alexandrian Greek colony on the confines of India 'between the rivers Kophen and the Indus' (Aśoka, p. 30). According to Dr. Raychaudhuri, the Kāmbojas were concentrated round their main city Rājapura (modern Rajaor) 'which lay to the south or south-east of Punch,' the western boundaries of their territory 'having reached Kafiristan' (*op. cit.*, p. 126); 'the tribal territory of the Gāndhāras at this time probably lay to the west of the Indus, and did not apparently include Takshaśilā which was ruled by a princely Viceroy', the capital of the *trans*-Indian Gandhāra having been Pushkaravatī, identified by Coomaraswamy with the site known as Mir Ziyarat or Bala Hisar at the junction of the Swat and Kabul rivers' (*op. cit.* p. 253). There is much to be said in favour of Dr. Bhandarkar's suggestion that the Shabazgarhi set of Aśoka's Rock Edicts was placed within the reach of the Yaunas, and the Mansehra set within that of the Kāmbojas, and for the matter of that, both within the reach of the Gāndhāras. I should better suggest that using the phraseology of the Great Epic (vi. I. 47), the Yaunas, Kāmbojas and Gāndhāras as ruling peoples may be treated as both *aparāntas* and *parāntas*, *trans*-Jhelum *trans*-Indus and *trans*-Kābul *trans*-Hindukush. They were so very alike in their social organisation, manners and customs, religious beliefs and fierce nature that they were indiscriminately banned as dreaded barbarians (Mahābhārata, VI. 1. 65 : *Yavanāś-Chīnā-Kāmbojā dārūṇā Mlechchhajātayah*).

9. Ristika-Petenikānam : The same as to say *Laṭhika-Petinikanam*, *Raṭhikanam* *Pitinikanam*, and *Laṭhika-Pitenikesu*. R.E. XIII substitutes *Bhoja* for *Ristika*. It is not quite correct to say with Jayaswal (Hindu Polity, I, p. 89) that R.E. XIII 'equates *Bhoja* with *Raṭhika*.' The two names, *Raṭhika* and *Bhojaka*, *Mahāraṭhi* and *Mahābhoja* are so closely associated in the Hāthigumphā and the Western India Cave inscriptions that one may take one of



them to imply the other, with the result that the expression *Laṭhika-Pitenikesu* really stands for *Laṭhika-Bhoja-Pitenikesu*, and *Bhoja-Pitinikeshu* for *Bhoja-Laṭhika-Pitinikeshu*. *Petenika*, *Petinika* or *Pitinika* being found common to both the expressions, Dr. Bhandarkar inclines (*Aśoka*, p. 33 f.) to treat it as an adjective, in the sense of 'hereditary', to both *Raṭhika* and *Bhoja*. Jayaswal, on the other hand, interprets it (*Hindu Polity*, I, p. 89 f.) as a separate name and takes it to mean the hereditary *Rāshṭrikas* and *Bhojas* as distinguished from those who were non-hereditary. In support of this, he cites the authority of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* (VIII. 12, 14) in which 'one class of *Bhojas* is distinguished from the other by the expression *Bhojapitaram* or hereditary *Bhoja* (who himself a *Bhoja* would also be the father of a *Bhoja*)'. It is certain that *Petenika*, *Petinika* or *Pitinika* is the same designation as the Pali *Pettanika* met with in the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* and its commentary. Michelson proposes to derive it philologically from *Paitrayanika*, which, however, is nowhere met with in Sanskrit literature. Much reliance is placed on the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* in determining the position of the *Pettanika* in relation to the *Raṭṭhika*. This *Nikāya* contains practically two passages, in one of which (*ibid*, III, p. 76) '*pettanikassa* has been conjoined,' as pointed out by Dr. Bhandarkar (*Aśoka*, p. 34), 'to *raṭṭhikassa* so as to form one designation which is thereafter distinguished from a number of others', and in the other, as previously contended by me, *Raṭṭhika* and *Pettanika* find mention as two different designations. The first passage reads: *yadi vā rañño khattiyassa muddhābhisittasa, yadi vā raṭṭhikassa pettanikassa, yadi vā senāya senāpatikassa, yadi vā gāmagāmikassa* (better, *gāmaṇikassa*), *yadi vā pūgagāmaṇikassa, ye vā pana kulesu pachchekādhīpaccham karenti*. Literally, "whether of a reigning king duly consecrated, or of a *raṭṭhika pettanika*, or of a commander-in-chief of the army, or of a village headman, or of a leader of a trade-guild, or whosoever exercises dominant influence in society, each in his own sphere of action."

The second passage reads: *mayā pi kho etaṃ, bhikkhave, n'eva diṭṭhaṃ na sutāṃ rājā khattiyo muddhābhisitto yāvadatthaṃ seyyasukhaṃ passasukhaṃ middhasukhaṃ anuyutto viharānto yāvajīvaṃ rajjaṃ karente janapadassa vā piyo manāpo 'ti. Taṃ kiṃ maññatha, bhikkhave, api nu tumhehi diṭṭhaṃ vā sutāṃ vā raṭṭhiko pettaniko senāpatiko gāmagāmaṇiko pūgagāmaṇiko yāvadatthaṃ seyyasukhaṃ passasukhaṃ middhasukhaṃ anuyutto viharanto yāvajīvaṃ pūgagāmaṇikattaṃ karente pūgassa vā piyo manāpo 'ti? 'No h'etaṃ, bhante.'* Literally, "I, too, Brethren, have neither seen nor heard that a reigning king duly consecrated has reigned till the end of his life or become an object of love and affection to the country by constantly seeking to enjoy the softness of the bed, the ease of lying down, (and) the bliss of drowsiness as long as he pleases! 'What would you think, Brethren, and have you either seen or heard that the *Raṭṭhika*, the *Pettanika*, the Commander-in-chief, the Village-headman, (or) the leader of a guild has maintained the leadership of a guild till the end



of his life or become an object of love and affection of the guild by seeking to do the same ? "Verily this is not so, O Lord !"

The particulars about the rest being not supplied, we must seek light from the parallel passage and the commentary to clarify their position in relation to the sphere of action of each. The position of the village headman is evident from the very designation, *Gāma-gāmaṇika*, and that of the Commander-in-chief from the expression, *senāya senāpatikassa*, which occurs in the parallel passage. As for the position of the *Raṭṭhika* and the *Pettanika*, we have to depend entirely on the commentary which defines the position of the *Raṭṭhika* in relation to *raṭṭha*, and that of the *Pettanika* in relation to the *pitaras* : *raṭṭhaṃ bhuñjati ti raṭṭhiko*, "The *Raṭṭhika* is one who enjoys the income from the administration of a *rāshṭra*," and *pitarā dattaṃ sāpateyyaṃ bhuñjati ti pettaniko*, *pettaniko ti pitarā bhuttānubhuttaṃ bhuñjati*, "the *Pettanika* is one who enjoys the property bequeathed by his father and forefathers."

The jurisdiction defined or definable in the case of all but the *Pettanika* is understandable, e.g., the *janapada* or country as a whole in the case of the king, the *raṭṭha* or particular administrative division in that of the *Raṭṭhika*, the *senā* or army in that of the *Senāpati*, the *gāma* or village in that of the *Gāma-gāmaṇika* or *Gāma-bhojaka*, and the *pūga* or guild in that of the *Pūga-gāmaṇika*. Consistently with all these, one cannot suggest either the *pitaras* or forefathers or the *sāpateyya* or property as being the jurisdiction of the *Pettanika*. This designation would be meaningless as regards jurisdiction without its connection with that of the *Raṭṭhika*. Thus after a careful reconsideration of the matter, I cannot but endorse the interpretation of Dr. Bhandarkar, and substantially that of Jayaswal. The *Raṭṭhika-pettanikas* and *Bhoja-pettanikas* were the hereditary *Raṭṭhikas* and *Bhojakas* as distinguished from those who were non-hereditary. Buddhaghosa in his commentary on the *Raṭṭhapāla-Sūta* (*Papañcha-sūdanī*, Siamese Ed., III, p. 269), speaks of the *Raṭṭhapāla-kūla* ("Rāshṭrapāla family," "Rāshṭrapāla-line") and defines it as a family which is capable of maintaining the solidarity of a *rāshṭra* divided into factions and supporting it with food and money (*bhinnaṃ raṭṭhaṃ sandhāretuṃ pāletuṃ samatthe kule*), the traditional definition being :

*Sarājikaṃ chātuvannaṃ posetuṃ yaṃ pahossati*  
*Raṭṭhapāla-kūlaṃ nāma.*

It should be noted that the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* speaks of the *Raṭṭhika-pettanika* and *Gāma-gāmaṇika* or *Gāma-bhojaka* as official designations, while in R.E. V and R.E. XIII, we are to understand by the names *Laṭhika-pitinikas* and *Bhoja-pitinikas* two tribal peoples. But it may be shown that Aśoka himself had to distinguish between the *Laṭhikas* and *Bhojas* as ruling peoples, on the one hand, and the *Laṭhikas* and *Bhojas* as state-functionaries, on the other. The *Laṭhika-Pitinikas* as tribal peoples are described as *aparāntas* or south-



westerners in R.E. V. By implication the *Bhoja-Piṭinikas* and the *Andha-pālindas*, mentioned in R.E. XIII, are all to be counted among the *aparāntas* in the above sense. The *Rāṭhikas* as state-functionaries under the *Rajjukas* find mention in the Yerraguḍi copy of M.R.E., probably the administrative heads or feudal lords of the districts. Dr. Raychaudhuri aptly compares them (*op. cit.*, p. 163) with the *Rāshṭriyas* of the Junāgarh inscription of Rudradāman I who were, according to him, officials of the district. The *Mahāsenāpatis*, *Mahārāṭhis* and *Mahābhōjas* were evidently 'military' governors and feudatories' under the Sātavāhana rulers (*op. cit.*, p. 420 f.). Budhaghosa definitely speaks (Papañcha-sūdanī, Siamese Ed., III, Raṭṭhapāla-Sutta, p. 283) of the *Mahāmātras* and *Mahārāshṭrikas* as being 'officials of higher and higher ranks' *mahāmatta-mahārāṭṭhikādīnaṃ vasena uggata-uggata-parisaṃ*). As described in the Sumaṅgala-vilāsinī (I, p. 148), during a processional drive of king Ajātasatru out of his capital, the place assigned to the *Raṭṭhiyaputtas*, i.e., *Rāshṭriyas* or *Rāshṭrikas* among his large retinue was just between the *Mahāmātras* who were nicely dressed and the fittingly dressed Brahmins shouting the joy of victory. The *Rāshṭriyas* are said to have been gorgeously dressed holding swords or the like in their hands (*vividhālaṅkāra-paṭimaṇḍitā nānappakāra-āvudha-hatthā*).

Jayaswal characteristically observes (Hindu Polity, I, p. 95), that the *Rāshṭrikas* of the West who in Aśoka's inscriptions are in the group of the *Bhojas*, 'were a non-monarchical community,' and that Khāravela also mentions them in the plural, fighting him in league with the *Bhojakas*, and with paraphernalia of sovereignty.' But it would seem that by the expression 'all *Rāṭhikas* and *Bhojakas*' in Khāravela's inscription were meant so many individual ruling chiefs rather than two semi-independent tribal peoples as they figure in Aśoka's R.E. V and R.E. XIII. As Dr. B. C. Law points out (India as described, p. 106 f.), "In the Hāthigumphā inscription of Khāravela the *Rāṭhikas* and *Bhojakas* are introduced in such a manner as to leave no room for doubt that they were ruling chiefs of the Vidyādhara settlements. The Jambudīva-panṇatti . . . connects the Vidyādharas with the Vaitāḍhya or Vindhya range and speaks of their eighteen settlements (and sixty towns, *ibid.*, p. 44). When the Jātakas speaks of sixteen *Bhojaputtas*, one may understand that they were the ruling chiefs of sixteen Vidyādhara tracts along the Vindhyas."

The *Risṭikas* or *Rāshṭrikas* and *Bhojas* or *Bhojakas* as ruling races were not only neighbours but presumably off-shoots of one and the same people. According to the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VIII. 14), the *Bhojas* as a people were all Sātvats who anointed their rulers from amongst them and called them *Bhojas*, while in the Purāṇas (Matsya, 43. 48 ; 44. 46-48 ; Vāyu, 94. 52 ; 95. 18 ; 96. 1-2 ; Vishṇu, IV. 13. 1-6), the Sātvats and the *Bhojas* are described as off-shoots of the Yādavas of Mathurā (Raychaudhuri, *op. cit.*, p. 76 f.). The Arthaśāstra preserves (I. 6. 3) the tradition of a *Bhoja* king of Daṇḍaka who in consequence of making a lascivious attempt on a Brahmin girl perished with his kith and kin and kingdom (*Dāṇḍakyo nāma Bhojah . . . sabandhu-rāshṭro*



*vinanāsa*). The Sarabhaṅga Jātaka (No. 522), on the other hand, accounts for utter destruction of king Daṇḍaki together with his powerful kingdom by an insult meted out by him to a guileless hermit. In this Jātaka, Daṇḍaka is described as an empire, king Bhīmaratha (Bhīma of Vidabbha, Kumbhakāra Jātaka, No. 408), Atthaka (Ārshṭika) of Atthaka (Ṛishṭika), and Kāliṅga of Kalinga having freely acknowledged the suzerainty of king Daṇḍaki. The kingdom of Daṇḍaka lay, according to the Rāmāyaṇa (VII. 92. 16), between the Vindhya and Riksha mountains, while its capital Madhumanta was founded within an enclosure of hills (*parvata-rodhasi*, *ibid*, VII. 92. 17-18). It extended as far south as the Godāvarī, a description which well accords with that of the Jātaka which calls its capital Kumbhavatī, while the Mahāvastu (I, p. 363) mentions Nāsik as its main city (Raychaudhuri, *op. cit.*, p. 78). Both the Jātaka and the Rāmāyaṇa associate Vidarbha, the mainland of the Bhojas or Bhojakas, and Ṛishṭika, the mainland of the Ṛishṭikas or Rāshṭrikas, with Daṇḍaka and the Godāvarī region. In the latter (IV. 41. 8-11), Vidarbha and Ṛishṭika are placed in an environment of the Vindhyas, on the one hand, and the Godāvarī, the Nerbudda and the Krishṇabehnī, on the other, and in the midst of such countries of *Aparānta* as Mekala, Utkala, Daśārṇa, Mahishaka, Matsya, Kāliṅga, and Kauśika.

10. *ye anṇe aparātā* : Lit., "such other *aparāntas*", by which expression were meant 'such other western ruling races and their countries or states.' In R.E. V, they are typified by the *Yavnas*, *Kāmbojas* and *Gāndhāras*, on the one hand, and the *Ṛishṭika-Petenikas* or *Rathika-Pitinikas*, on the other. The Aśoka term *aparāntas*, as shown above, is applicable to the North-western as well as the South-western peoples and their countries or states, North-western understood in relation to the North-western Trade-route. Subsequently, the terms *Udichya-Uttarāpatha* (Northern, North-western), *Aparānta* (Western, South-western), *Dakṣiṇāpatha-Dākṣiṇātya* (Southern), and *Prāchya* (Eastern) came to denote the topographical divisions of India in relation to *Madhyadeśa* or Middle Country, the central region having been distinguished in some of the texts as *Vindhya-nivāsins* or *Vindhyapriṣṭha-nivāsins* (i.e., the Vindhyan). The definition of these divisions which was shaping itself through centuries, has varied, more or less, with times and texts. The peoples of the same or similar names are located in different divisions, making the confusion sometimes worse confounded. For instance, in the Mahābhārata (VI. 9. 40-41), the Bhojas as a people are grouped with the *Chedis*, *Matsyas*, *Karūshas*, *Sindhupulindakas*, *Uttamas*, *Daśārṇas*, *Mekalas* and *Utkalas*, the peoples who are described in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa (Bhāratakhaṇḍ) as *Vindhyans*; the *Vidarbhas* who are once grouped with the *Gomantas* and *Mandakas* in the Mahābhārata (VI. 9. 43), are again associated in the same text (VI. 9. 64) with the *Ṛishikas*, and both are located in South India. The Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, too, refers the *Mahārāṣṭras*, *Vaidarbhas*, *Daṇḍakas*, *Mahishikas*, *Vanavāsikas*, *Mūshikas*, *Āṭavyas*, and



*Pulindas* to *Dakṣiṇāpatha*. In the *Rāmāyaṇa* (iv. 41. 8-11), as we saw, *Avrāvantī*, *Avantī*, *Vidarbha*, *Ṛishṭika*, *Mahishaka*, *Matsya*, *Kaliṅga* and *Kauśika* are placed within the belt of the *Vindhya*, the *Godāvarī*, the *Narmadā* and the *Kṛishṇabenī*, while apart from them, we have mention of *Andhra*, *Puṇḍra*, *Chola*, *Pāṇḍya* and *Kerala* (ibid., iv. 4. 12.). The association of *Aśmaka* (identified by *Bhaṭṭasvāmī*, the commentator of the *Arthaśāstra*, with *Mahārāshṭra*), with *Pāṇḍurāshṭra*, *Goparāshṭra* and *Mallarāshṭra* in the *Mahābhārata* (vi. 9. 44) is also noteworthy. To make a cosmos out of this chaos, one must suppose that the *Rāshṭrikas* and *Bhojas* as ruling races held territories in the *Vindhya* region to the north of the *Godāvarī* and *Narmadā*, as well as farther south, between the *Godāvarī* and the *Kṛishṇabenī*, and, on the whole, near about and around *Paṭiṭṭhāna*, *Pratiṣṭhāna* (modern *Paithān*), the then terminus of the South-western branch of the great Trade-route. And in these very regions we are to locate the tribal states of the *Andhras* and *Pāṇḍas*.

So far as *Aśoka* is concerned, he was just interested in particularly mentioning those tribal areas, where it was difficult to propagate his noble messages, and to convert the inhabitants to the Indo-Aryan faith, especially to Buddhism. R.E. XIII adds two names, the *Nābhakas* and the *Nābhapaṃktis* to the list of the North-western peoples, and two names, the *Andhras* and the *Pāṇḍas* to that of the South-western races. The same edict introduces us also to some troublesome hill tribes called *Āṭavyas* (*Āṭaviyo*).

Who were they? Dr. Bhandarkar arbitrarily takes the expression *Nābhaka-Nābhapaṃktī* to mean the *Nābhapaṃktis* of *Nābhaka* (*Aśoka*, p. 40), in spite of the fact that he translates it (*op. cit.*, p. 331) by "the *Nābhakas* and *Nābhapaṃktis*." On the false assumption that R.E. XIII has substituted 'the *Nābhaka* and the *Nābhapaṃktis*' for the *Gāndhāras* in R.E. V, Jayaswal suggests: "These were either neighbours of the *Gāndhāras* or some sub-divisions thereof. The *Nābhapaṃktis* (*Nābhalines*) were like the *Agrāśrenis*, and the Three *Yaudheyas* or Three *Śālankāyanas*, i.e., a league of the *Nābhas*. In one edition of *Aśoka's* inscriptions they are called *Nābhītina* which may mean the Three-*Nābhas*." The *Shahbazgarhi* variant *Nābhītina* is evidently a scribe's mistake for *Nābhīpaṃtinam*. Further, it is true that in the *Gaṇapāṭha* on *Pāṇini*, iv. 1. 112, the name *Nābhaka* is derived from *Nabhaka* and *Aurṇanābha* from *Ūṇanābha* (evidently the name of a *Ṛishi*) or that in the same work on *Pāṇini*, iv. 2. 53, the *Aurṇanābhas* or *Ūṇanābhas* appear in the list of the *Rājanyas*, *Ārjunāyanas*, etc. Even one may show that the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* mentions the *Ūṇas* as one of the *Kirāta* races of *Udīchya*. But where is the evidence to prove that the *Ūṇanābhas* were the *Nābhas* of the 'woollen' country, i.e., of *Gandhāra* which 'was famous for its wool'?

Bühler inclines to identify the *Nābhaka* with *Nābhikapura* which the *Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa* locates in the *Uttarakuru* or some *trans-Himalayan* region (*Beiträge zur Erklärung Asoka-Inschriften*, p. 118), a suggestion which is weakened by the fact that, according to *Aśoka's* edicts, the *Nābhakas* and



Nābhapaṃktis were like the Yaunas and Kāmbojas North-western peoples within Aśoka's empire. Mr. Govinda Pai (Aiyangar Commemoration Volume, p. 36) draws attention to the Nabhakānanas, who being a people placed by the Mahābhārata (vi. 9. 50) in South India do not meet the requirement. The Mahābhārata (ii. 8. 19) speaks of Nābhāga as a *rājarshi*, and Nābhāga is evidently a local epithet like Auśinari, used as a personal name. Among the Punjab States, Nābhā preserves the name of Nābhaka of Aśoka's edict, and Patiala (Paṃktipālā) that of Nābhapaṃkti. There is every reason to believe that the Nābhakas and Nābhapaṃktis had their territories, then as now, in the Himalayan region, near about Kalsi in the District of Dehradun, where a complete set of Rock Edicts was engraved. According to Dr. Raychaudhuri (*op. cit.*, p. 254), Nābhaka may probably be identified with Fa Hien's Na-pei-kea, the birthplace of Krakuchchhanda Buddha, about 10 miles south or south west of Kapilavastu. In the Nṛsiṃha Purāṇa, Ch. 30, Nābhi is described as the paramount ruler of the Himalayan region (*Himālayasyādhipater Nābher Rishabhaj putro babhūva*). The Shahbazgarhi variant *Nābhi* for *Nābha* is not without its importance in this respect. The extension of the Nābhaka and Nābhapaṃkti States over the eastern plains of the Punjab might have taken place at a later date. In all probability the Nābhakas and Nābhapaṃktis represented a group of Himalayan States, the Nābhaka or Nābhika having been the most important (Medinī suggests *mukhyanyāya* as a synonym of *nābhi*).

The Andhras and Pārindas are two other peoples to be included in the list of *aparāntas*. Apparently they are to be grouped with the Rīṣṭika-Petenikas and Bhoja-Pitīnikas. That is to say, they are to be treated as south-westerners. As regards the first, all the copies of R.E. XIII agree as to the spelling of the name. But as regards the second, the copies range themselves into two groups, one giving the name as Pārinda or Pālinda, and the other as Pālada. The Kalsi and Yerragudi Pālada is phonetically the same name as Pārada, as pointed out by Dr. Raychaudhuri (*op. cit.*, p. 258 f.). If the intended people are Pāradas, they must be counted as north-westerners, inasmuch as the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa definitely locates them in Udīchya along with the Aparāntas, Gāndhāras, Yavanas, Kāmbojas, and the rest. In the Harivaṃśa (I. 14) and the Vāyu Purāṇa (Ch. 88), too, the Pāradas who are otherwise described as *muktakeshū* ("those having dishevelled hair"), find mention 'in a list of barbarous tribes (*Mlechchhajātayah*) along with the Śakas, Yavanas, Kāmbojas, Pahlavas, Khasas, Mahishikas, Cholas, Keralas, etc., i.e., the tribes some of whom belonged to the north, and some to the south. Their association with the Andhras in R.E. XIII cannot but create a presumption in favour of their being south-westerners, a fact which is strengthened by the Gīrnār variant *Pārinda*, and the Palida (=Palimda) of Sh and M. So far as literature is concerned, the people associated with the Andhras are called either Puṇḍras in the Rāmāyaṇa (IV. 41. 12), or *Pulindas* in the *Purāṇas*. The name Paṇḍras, too, is met with in the *Purāṇas*. In the same text of the Matsya Purāṇa, the Paṇḍras are distinguish-



ed from the Pulindas, the former associated with the Vaidiśas, Mekalas, and Gaunardas, and the latter with the Andhras, Śakas, Chūlikas, and Yavanas (Pargiter, *Dynasties of the Kali Age*, p. 16), the Chūlikas and Yavanas being placed by the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa in Udīchya. The same Purāṇa places the Pulindas in Madhyadeśa, Dākṣiṇātya, as well as Aparānta. The Rāmāyaṇa (IV. 41. 10-12) locates the Andhras, Puṇḍras, Cholas, Pāṇḍyas, and Keralas in the region below the Godāvarī. Vincent A. Smith takes the Andhras to be a Dravidian people, now represented by the large population speaking the Telugu language, who occupied the deltas of the Godāvarī and the Kṛishṇā. But it is safer to think with Srinivas Iyengar that they were originally a Vindhya people, 'whose territories extended from west to east down the valleys of the Godāvarī and the Kṛishṇā.'

Even with the additional names supplied in R.E. XIII the intended Aśoka's list of *aparāntas* or western peoples cannot be supposed to have been exhausted. The enumeration of peoples and countries in the Mahābhārata, Bhīshmaparva, IX. 38-70, according to *Ūrddhva* (Northern) and *Dakṣiṇa* (Southern), *Prāchya* (Eastern) and Udīchya, Uttarāpatha (North-western) does not clear up the position of the *aparāntas*. The Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, however, expressly includes the following peoples in the Aparānta division: the Saurpārakas, Kālanadas, Dullas, Tāliyakas, Kāraskaras, Lohajaṅghas, Vāneyas, Rājabhadrakas, Kośalas, Traipuras, Vaidiśas, Tushāras, Tumbaras, Pāṭavas, Naishadas, Pulindas, Suśīlas, Rūpamāns, Tāmasas, Kurumiṇas, Nāsikas, and other who are called Vai-vāntara-Narmadas, Mārūkachchhas (Pali Bhārūkachchhas:), Samāheyas, Sārasvatas, Kachchhīyas, Surāshṭras, Āvantyas and Āravudas. Thus the first name in the list of western countries is Sūrpāraka (modern Sopārā) which was really the chief town and port of what is called Sunāparānta (Majjhima-N., III, p. 268; Saṃyutta-N., IV, p. 61), or simply Aparānta (Dīpavaṃsa, viii. 7; Mahāvamsa, xii. 5; Samanta-pāsādikā, I, p. 67). Sūnāparānta was in the Buddha's time a country on the western sea-board of India, the people of which were known to the early preachers of Buddhism as "fierce and rude" (*chaṇḍā pharusā*), and it was at Sopārā that one set of Rock Edicts was engraved. The Gīrnār set of Rock Edicts was engraved in Surāshṭra, which the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa places in the Aparānta division. According to Aśoka's edicts, among the *aparāntas* one is to count even the Rishṭikas and Rishṭika-Paitrayanikas, the Bhojas and Bhoja-Paitrayanikas, the Andhras and Pārindas (Puṇḍras, Pulindas?), in other words, the peoples including the Āṭavyas (*Āṭaviyo*, R.E. XIII) whom the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa locates in South India, i.e., India south of the Vindhya range and the Godāvarī. The Mahābhārata (Bhīshmaparva, IX), too, follows almost the same mode of enumeration in speaking of southern peoples and countries (*janapadā dakṣiṇā*). The alignment of Aśoka's *aparāntas* or peoples placed near about the south-western end of the great Trade-route may be determined by the find spots of the following inscriptions: as for the north, the Rock Edicts at Gīrnār in Surāshṭra, one copy of



M.R.E. at Bairāt in Jaipur State, Rājputānā, (ancient Virāṭapura, capital of Matsya), a second copy of the same at Rūpnāth in the District of Jubbulpore, Central Provinces, and a third copy at Sahasrām in Shahabad District, Behar; and as for the south, the Rock Edicts at Sopārā, one copy of M.R.E. at Pālki-guṇḍu near Kopbal in the extreme south-west corner of Hyderabad, another copy of the same at Māski in the District of Raichur, Hyderabad, called Mosaṅgi as well as Mosage in some of the later inscriptions, a name reminding us of Mūshaka or Mūshika, and a third copy at Yerraguḍi in the District of Karnool, which lay just to the north of the then known Chola country, a little below the river Kṛishṇā which appears to have formed the southern natural boundary of the Andhra territory, and not improbably in the territory of the Pārindas (Puṇḍras, Pulindas;) traditionally associated together with the Andhras. The rock at Yerraguḍi bears also a complete set of Fourteen Rock Edicts, placed apparently within the reach of the Cholas, the Andhras and the Pārindas. Certain it is that to the south of the Kṛishṇā lay the southern province of Aśoka's empire placed in charge of the Āryaputra-in-Council. In the absence of any reliable data, it will be risky to identify the rock at Yerraguḍi with Suvarṇagiri which lent its name to the seat of southern viceroyalty. If the southern province may be correctly supposed to have been constituted mainly of Vanavāsī and Mahisharāshṭra Mahishamaṇḍala (ancient Mysore), one may with Dr. Mookerji locate Isila (Rishila) having in its neighbourhood three copies of M.R.E. and in the modern Chitaldrug District of Mysore in the land of the Vanavāsikas, while one must yet wait for the discovery of at least one more copy of the same further south in ancient Mahisharāshṭra situated between Chola and Pāṇḍya, on one side, and Satiyaputra and Keralaputra, on the other. Indeed the traditional list of places in India to which Buddhist missions are claimed to have been sent under the auspices of Maudgalīputra Tishya and during the reign of Aśoka may well indicate the position of Aśoka's *aparāntas*, north north-western and south south-western peoples. The list includes such places in India as Kāsmīra Gandhāra, Yonarāshṭra, Himavanta (Nābhaka-Nābhapaṁkti), Mahārāshṭra, Aparānta or Sūnāparānta, Vanavāsī (Isila), and Mahisharāshṭra.

11. Bhaṭamayesu baṁbhanibhiyesu anāthesu vudhesu hitasukhāye dhammayutāye apalibodāye : Lit., "for the good and happiness (and) lawful unfeeling of the *bhaṭamayas*, the *brāhmaṇa-ibhiyas* the helpless and the aged." The Dhauri variant of *bhaṭamaya* is *bhaṭimaya*, and that of *vudha* is *mahālaka*. The parallel statement in P.E. VII reads : *vayomahālakānaṁ anupatīpati yā, bābhana-samanesu kapana-valākesu āva dāsa-bhaṭakesu saṁpatīpati yā*. Here the correspondence evidently lies between *vudha*, mahālaka (R.E. V) and *vayomahālaka* (P.E. VII); between *anātha* (R.E. V) and *kapana-valāka*; between *baṁbhanaiḥ* (R.E. V) and *bābhana-samana* (P.E. VII); and between *bhaṭamaya*,



*bhaṭimaya* (R.E. V) and *dāsa-bhaṭaka* (P.E. VII). But the question is—is the suggested correspondence justified in all the four cases? As for the first two cases, the proposed correspondence is fully justified, and as regards the last two cases, it is justified at least between half and half. Now, what about the other half? It is the same to say “the supportless” as to say “the poor and the wretched”; the same to say “the aged” as to say “those advanced in years, seniors by age”. The two expressions *bābhana-samana* or *samana-bābhana* and *dāsa-bhaṭaka* are of frequently met with in other inscriptions as well. Bhandarkar (Aśoka, p. 342 f.) eliminates *dāsa-bhaṭaka* from the Rock list by treating *bhaṭamaya* or *bhaṭimaya* as=Sk. *bhṛitamaya*, meaning “consisting of hirelings” and as an adjective to *bāmbhanibhiya*, “Brāhmaṇs and Gṛihapatis consisting of hirelings”. There are various other suggestions, e.g., *bhaṭamaya*=*bhaṭa-m-arya*, “soldiers and warriors” (Bühler);= *bhaṭa-m-aya*, “servants and masters” (Franke);= *bhṛita-m-ārya*, “soldiers and their chiefs” (Mookerji). Raychaudhuri is inclined to suggest that here *bhaṭamaya*, which is=*bhṛitya-m-arya*, stands for “the Śūdras and the Vaiśyas”, while *bāmbhanibhiya* which is=*brāhmaṇa-ibhya* stands for “the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas”; in other words, the two words denote the four recognised castes or classes of the Indo-Aryan society. I differ from all except Bühler, whose explanation is nearer the truth. Bhandarkar is fully justified in pointing out that the Dhauli variant *bhaṭi* compels us to take *bhaṭa* in the sense of “servants”, and prevents us from taking it in the sense of “soldiers”. I see no phonetic difficulty in equating *aya* with *arya*, “Vaiśyas”, or with *ārya* “masters”, although according to Bhandarkar had the word been meant for *ārya*, it could have been *aliya* in Dh and not *aya*. As for taking the two words, *bhaṭa-m-aya* and *bāmbhana-ibhiya*, to denote the four *varṇas*, we have the authority of Patañjali (gloss on Pāṇini, iv. 1. 63) to equate *ibhya* with *Kshatriya*, and that of any Sanskrit lexicon to equate *aya* with *arya* in the sense of *Vaiśya*. This would have given, no doubt, a good sense to say that Aśoka employed his *Dharmamaṭiāmātras* for the welfare and protection of Hindu population in the territories of the Yaunas, Kāmbhojas and Gāndhāras and such other *aparāntas* who had presumably adhered to a different social organisation of their own. But two points remain yet to be settled : is *m* in *bhaṭamaya* or *bhaṭimaya* euphonic, and is Patañjali’s meaning of *ibhya* universally accepted? In the Jaina Āgama the word *ibha* stands for *ādhyā* or “the rich”, and, as Bühler pointed out, in Pali the scholiasts equate *ibbhā* with *gahapatikā*, i.e., the *Vaiśyas*. The Chhāndogya Upanishad (I. 10. 1) mentions a locality of *Ibhyas*, *Ibhyagrāma*, and Śaṅkara takes the word *ibhya* to mean a chief or elephant-rider : *ibho hastī, tam arhatīti īsvaro hastyāroho vā*. Here again Bhandarkar’s objection remains valid, that the Dhauli variant *bhaṭimaya* stands in the way of treating *m* as euphonic and equating *bhaṭamaya* (Girnār, *bhatamaya*) with any other word but *bhṛitamaya*. Both *bhṛitamaya* and *bhṛitimaya* (also *bhaṭamaya*) may be explained as meaning “one living on wages (*karmamūlyam*)”. The suggestion made by me (*ante*, p. 28) that “*bhatamaya* (G) may even be construed as a *sandhi*



of *bhata* (hirelings, servants) and *amaya* (slaves), derived from such an expression as *āmāya dāsā* in *Jātaka*, VI, p. 285" is rather far-fetched. In support of my suggestion that here *ibhiya* or *ibhya* stands for the *Śramaṇas*, reference may be had to the *Saṃyutta-Nikāya*, *Devaputta Saṃyutta*, iii. 3, where we have mention of *samaṇa-brāhmaṇa* along with *kaṇa*, *addhika*, *vaṇibbaka* and *yāchaka* as persons deserving of royal and public charity, just as we find *bam-bhanibhiya* associated with *anātha* and *vudha* in R.E. V, and *bābhana-samaṇa* associated with *kaṇa-valāka* and *vayomahālaka* as persons deserving special care and attention. Buddhaghosa offers the following comment on the expression *samaṇa-brāhmaṇa-kaṇa-addhika-vaṇibbaka-yāchakānaṃ* : Here the word *samaṇā* means those appearing as ascetics, and *brāhmaṇā*, those claiming to be Brāhmins by birth. These classes of *Śramaṇas* and *Brāhmaṇas* do not represent the truly saintly personages. The word *kaṇā* means those in a pitiful condition, the poor people suffering from bodily infirmity ; *addhikā*, the street-beggars (*pathāvino*) ; *vaṇibbakā*, those beggars who induce the public to offer alms and make gifts by proclaiming the merit that accrues from almsgiving and gifts ; and *yāchakā*, the beggars imploring the public to spare anything, however little and insignificant.

Going by this explanation, we are to take the *Brāhmaṇa-Ibhya*s of R.E. V and the *Brāhmaṇa Śramaṇas* of P.E. VII in the sense of beggarly Brahmins and ascetics, and not the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Śramaṇas* who were truly religious persons. Similarly by the *anāthas* and *vṛiddhas mahālakas* of R.E. V and *kṛiṇa-varākas* and *vayo-mahallakas* of P.E. VII we must understand all the four classes of beggars defined above.

12. *paṭividdhānāye apalibodhāye mokhāye* : One of the important functions of the *Dharmamahāmātrās* was to temper justice with mercy. They were required to do something for the benefit of the prisoners (*baṃdhana-badhasa*). The life of a prisoner (*puriso bandhanāgāre baddho*), like that of a slave (*dāso*), is delineated as a state of woe by the Buddha in the *Sāmaññaphala Sutta*, and release from a prison, like emancipation from servitude, is held out as a state of well-being : *yathā bandhanāgāraṃ yathā dāsavyaṃ, yathā bandhanā mokkhaṃ yathā bhujissaṃ*. The Buddha would congratulate a prisoner who gets his release without the payment of ransom, without the loss of fortune (*avyayena*). The edict speaks of these three ways of giving benefit to the prisoners : *paṭividdhāna*, *apalibodha*, and *mokha*. According to R.E. VIII, *paṭividdhāna* is just another word for *hiraṇya-paṭividdhāna*, "procuring of money, provision of money to pay the ransom," the *hiraṇya* (lit., gold, or gold coin) typifying all media of exchange, cp. *Khuddakapāṭha*, *Tirokuḍḍa Sutta* : *hiraṇṇena kāyakkayaṃ*. The G and Sh variant of *apalibodha* is *aparigodha*. Dr. F. W. Thomas (J.R.A.S., 1915, p. 99 f.) rightly equates *parigodha* with *parigriddha* in the sense of "attached, entangled" being met with in the *Divyāvadāna* (p. 351). Pali *gedha* meaning "desire", "greed" or "worldliness". In S.R.E.



I, however, *palibodha* carries with it the idea of *parikilesa*, "torture," "coercion". In Pali, we sometimes have *rodha* as a variant of *gedha*, which in rare instances means also a "cave". Indeed, *aparirodha* would have better served as a variant of *apalibodha*, the opposite of *palibodha*, which means in Pali 'a handicap', 'that which fetters', restrains or restricts man's liberty, freedom of movement, thought, speech and action". Thus 'unfettering' is a good English rendering of *apaii-bodha*. Here, as well as in P.E. V, *mokha* stands for *bandhana-moksha*, 'release from prison', 'delivery from jail', cp. *Bāndhanamokkha Jātaka*. In connection with *paṭivīdhāna*, the important point to decide is whether the money was needed for the ransom or for the maintenance of the family of a prisoner until his release. As for *palibodha* and *parikilesa* that were incidental to prison-life, Aśoka in his S.R.E. I, says, "(There) is even a single man who suffers either arrest (*palibodha*) or torture (*palikilesa*). There occurs on that account a sudden culmination in imprisonment (*bandhanantika*), and others, the blood-relations (and) many people distantly related feel grieved." The reason of having children to maintain weighed with Aśoka as an argument in favour of *paṭivīdhāna* in the case of a prisoner. As regards *apalibodha* and *aparikilesa*, the following note is worth quoting from Mookerji (Asoka, p. 143): "On the whole subject of the unjust imprisonment (*bandhana*), execution (*vadha*), and torture (*palibodha*) of prisoners, it is interesting to note that Kauṭilya (IV. 8) also warns the Superintendent of Jails against these. He is liable to fines for confining persons in lock-up without declaring the reason (*saṃruddhakam anākhyāya chārayataḥ*); for putting them to unjust torture (*karma-kārayataḥ*); for denying them food and drink; for molesting them (*pariklesayataḥ*); and for causing their death (*ghnataḥ*)." According to Kauṭilya, a female prisoner was sometimes a victim of rape or molestation. But I cannot say with Mookerji: "Thus the work of Asoka's *Dharmamahāmātras* in respect of these matters lay with the superintendents of different jails in his empire, who were responsible for much unjust suffering for the people." What is more likely is that Aśoka's *Dharmamahāmātras* were employed to exercise a general supervision over the whole of jail administration with a view to the amelioration of the condition of prisoners.

13. *anubandha*, *anubadha*, *anubandhā* (K): Jayaswal (J.B.O.R.S. IV, p. 144 f.) has sought to explain this word in the sense of *anubandhas* or "grounds for relief" in the light of Smṛiti texts (Manu, viii. 126; Gautama, xii. 51; Vasishṭha, xix. 91; Yājñavalkya, i. 367; also Kauṭilya, IV. 8). But neither the construction of the sentence nor the sense of *anubandha*, *anubadha* or *anubandhā* is clear to me. I wish the sentence read like this: *bandhana-badhasa paṭivīdhānāye apalibodhāye mokhāye cha viyāpaṭāse iyaṃ anubandha pajā ti va kaṭābhikāle ti va mahālake ti va* (Dh). Ye has *pajavi*, K, *pajāva*, Sh, *prajava* = *prajāvān*, 'one having children.' With the single exception of K, *anubandha* or *anubadha* is without any suffix, and it compels us to treat it as the first word of the compound, *anubandha-pajāvi*, *anubandhapajā anubaddha-prajā*, in



which case the word must mean "those who are encumbered (lit. bound up) with children", an interpretation which is not permitted by *pajāvi* or *pajāva* as second word of the compound. In the absence of the reading *anubāṇdham*, it is difficult to treat *anubāṇdha* or *anubadha* as anything but part of a compound. Accordingly the better rendering of the sentence will be :

"They are occupied for providing a person kept in prison with ransom, for his unfettering and for his release, this in the case of those encumbered with children, or those who have shown good conduct, or those who are aged." The word *anubāṇdha-pajā* or *anubāṇdha-pajāvi*, treated as a compound, admits of two other interpretations, as shown below. *anubāṇdha-pajā kaṭābhikāle mahālake* (Dh). Instead of *anubāṇdha-pajā*, Ye has *anubāṇdha-pajāvi*, and K, *anubadhā pajāva*. The Ye and K spelling of *kaṭābhikāle* is *kaṭābhikāle*. The G variant of *mahālake* is *thairesu*. Here we have an enumeration of apparently three special circumstances in which clemency was to be shown to prisoners. The first is when the prisoners happened to be *anubāṇdha-pajā*. We may take it that the intended spelling is *anubāṇdha*, and not *anubadha*. According to the Amarakosha (Nānārtha-varga), the word *anubandha* may mean *mukhyānyāyī* (*mukhyān pitrādikam anuyāyī*) *śiṣu*, "a child partaking of the hereditary nature." So *anubāṇdha-pajā* may be explained as meaning "children with a (criminal) heredity," and *anubāṇdha-pajāva*, as meaning "(naturally wicked) children and prisoners having children." As for *kaṭābhikāla*, Senart's comparison with the Vedic *abhikṛitvarīḥ*, 'female demons who are bewitchers' is inapt. The equation with *kṛitābhichāra*, 'one on whom black arts have been practised', i.e., 'one who has committed a criminal offence under the hypnotic or occultic influence of others', may be allowed. The Arthasāstra speaks of *kṛityābhichāra*, where *kṛityā* and *abhichāra* are but two different forms of 'charm,' 'incantation', in short, of black arts. But in Aśokan expression, the first word is definitely *kaṭa*, *kata* or *kṛita*, and not *kṛityā*. I am for equating *kaṭābhikāla* with the Pali *katādhikāra* which phonetically as well as technically fits in with the Aśokan term, cp. *dharmādhithāne* (Dh), *dharmā-abhithāne* (Ye). As explained in the Jātaka Commentary, *katādhikāro*, *adhikārakato* means *pubbe katupakāro*, 'one who has rendered service in the past.' At Jātaka, VI, p. 251, a king is advised to allow rest and pension (*parihāraṃ*) to the domestic animals, the beasts of burden, in consideration of their incapacity for work due to old age and in that of the useful service rendered by them when they were strong in youth. The Aśokan consideration of old age is expressed by the word *mahālakā* or *thaira*. As for *kaṭābhikāla* applied to a prisoner deserving clemency, it cannot but mean in its equation with *katādhikāra*, 'one who has acquired the right to clemency by his previous conduct or good service.' Let us see what light the Arthasāstra throws on the point. Kautilya (II. 36. 56) expressly lays down :: "On the days to which the birth star of the king is assigned, as well as on full moon days, such prisoners as are young, old, diseased, or helpless (*anātha*) shall be let out from the jail (*bandhanāgāra*); or those who have



made any agreement with the prisoners may liberate them by paying an adequate ransom. Once in a day, or once in five nights, jails may be emptied of prisoners in consideration of the work they have done (*karmanā*), or of whipping inflicted upon them, or of an adequate ransom paid by them in gold (*hiranyānugraheṇa*). Whenever a new country is conquered, when an heir-apparent is installed on the throne, or when a prince is born to the king, prisoners are usually set free" (Shamasastri). Thus Kauṭilya's term *karma* or the work done by the prisoners as a condition of release or clemency well suits the above interpretation of *kaṭābhikāla*. Hultzsch doubtfully reads the meaning of incurable illness into the Aśokan word, which is without any justification. Bühler explains it in the sense of "overwhelmed by misfortune" from the use of the word *abhikīraṭi* (Jātaka IV, p. 125), meaning "oppresses, overpowers," which, too, is evidently far-fetched, and not supported by any literary usage. The consideration of the young age of the offenders may be taken as suggested by *anubandha-prajā*. The edict in question shows concern for the helpless and the aged. To ensure human treatment of slaves and servants and amelioration of their socio-economic condition must have been within the province of normal official duties of the *Dharmamahāmātras*.

14. *Pāṭalipute cha bāhīrasu cha [nāgareshu]*: Lit., "at Pāṭaliputra as well as in outer towns," the latter being, according to Mookerji, "the provincial or mufussil towns." The statement in the edict in question is of interest as suggesting that Pāṭaliputra was the capital of Aśoka's empire. This, when read together with the introductory phrase, *Piyadasī lājā Māgadhe*, of the Bhābru Edict, suggests further that Pāṭaliputra continued to be the Magadhan capital up till the reign of Aśoka, if not long after that. The Mahāparinibbāna Sutta sets forth the circumstances that led to the fortification of the village of Pāṭaligāma on the right bank of the Ganges. It reveals to us names of the two Brahmin ministers of king Ajātaśatru under whose personal supervision the city was being built up in the last year of the Buddha's life. The Pali Chronicles tell us that the capital was transferred by Udāyin or Udayabhadra, the son and successor of Ajātaśatru, from Rājagṛha to Pāṭaliputra. Who christened the new city as Pāṭaliputra with Pāṭaligāma in its historical background, we cannot say. Although the later Buddhist legends seek to fantastically account for origin of its name, it is undeniable that it is the same kind of a place-name as Kesaputta, Seriyāputa, Satiyaputra and Keralaputra. In R.E. V, Aśoka is concerned to mention his capital and to refer to other Mofussil towns only in connexion with his *orodhas* and those of his brothers, sisters, and other kith and kin. As regards his own *orodhas* or *avarodhanas*, Mookerji (Asoka, p. 143 f.) observes: "in this connection we may instance the case of his wife, Devī of Vedisagiri, who, according to the Ceylon legends, permanently resided there, instead of coming to Pāṭaliputra to live there with her royal



husband and children. Similarly, a second *avarodhana* or harem of Asoka must have been maintained for his second queen, Kāruvākī, the mother of Prince Tivara, at the city of Kauśāmbī."

This must not, however, be taken uncritically. The Pali legend regarding Asoka's connection with Devī and her residence at Vidiśā still needs corroboration from the inscriptions. The fact of his having a separate establishment for his second queen, Kāruvākī does not find mention in the legends; it is just a surmise from a circumstantial evidence, namely, the engraving of the edict on the Kauśāmbī pillar which bears other inscriptions of Asoka as well. The introductory clause of this edict is not decisive at all as regards its bearing on Kauśāmbī, and in this respect it differs entirely from that of the Kauśāmbī copy of the Schism Pillar Edict. It was only by an accident that a copy of this edict was engraved on the Kauśāmbī pillar, and there is nothing to prevent us thinking that it was meant to be engraved elsewhere also. On the other hand, the edict under notice leads us to think that the second queen's donations were not confined to one place, otherwise the direction "the *Mahāmātras* everywhere should be informed" (*savata mahāmātā vataviyā*) would have been meaningless. It is certain that Pāṭaliputra and the Mofussil towns are mentioned not only in connection with Asoka's own *orodhas* but also in connection with the *orodhas* of his brothers, sisters and other kith and kin. In P.E. VII, he speaks of all his *orodhas* without any place reference. The Vinaya Mahāvagga, I. 1 and the Jātakas agree in telling us that kings, princes and other aristocrats had three residences, one for summer, one for winter, and one for the rainy season. How many residences Asoka had with closed female apartments and where these were situated, we have no means to know from his inscriptions. His main palace was situated, of course, at Pāṭaliputra, probably with separate apartments for his different queens.

15. *savesu olodhanesu* (Dh): The same as to say *savasi me olodhanasi* (P. E. VII): "in all my harems" (Hultzsch); "in all (my) closed female apartments" (Bhandarkar); I prefer "in all my households", "in all my domestic arrangements", which is suggested also by Bhandarkar (Asoka, p. 12). Evidently 'harem' as an English rendering of *orodha*, Sk. *avarodhana* is inappropriate in R.E. V which in the same breath speaks also of the *orodhas* of Asoka's sisters (*bhagininaṃ cha*). We meet with the word *orodha* also in R.E. VI, where *orodha* denotes a structure of Asoka's palace distinct from the *bhojanasālā* (dining hall), *gabhāgāra* (bed-chamber), and *vacha* (promenade); it is to be distinguished also from the *mahānasa* (kitchen, R.E. I). Taking the container to stand for the contained in R.E. VI, I propose to translate *orodha* by "the inner circle of the royal household", it being just another word for *antaḥpura*, Pali *antepura*. As appears from the Mūgapakkha Jātaka, the *itthāgāra*, Sk. *stryāgāra* was that part of the *orodha* where a king or prince was entertained with pranks and music by clever women (*chaturitthiyo*). According to the Pali



Aṇḍabhūta Jāṭaka, the institution of *orodha* originated from an idea of keeping women in seclusion. The *pardah* was strictly observed, except on festival days, by ladies of all aristocratic families (Visākhā-vatthu, Dhammapada-Commentary). As regards inmates of Aśoka's *orodha*, Bhandarkar (Aśoka, p. 12 f.) observes that in P.E. VII, he first speaks of himself and his queens, and that immediately after his queens he refers to his *avarodhana*, a fact which may lead one to think that there were in his household 'women other than his queens,' his 'left-handed wives,' 'pardah ladies of lower status'. This is true, but not to be construed from Aśoka's statement in P.E. VII: *mama cheva devinaṃ cha savasi cha me olodhanasi*, which only suggests that Aśoka spoke of all his households with reference to himself and his queens. In the very next statement, we have mention of his sons (*dālakānaṃ*). A stock phrase in the Jātakas (Mūgapakkha, Chandakumāra, Vidhūrapaṇḍita, Vessantara) reads: *orodhā cha kumārā cha vesiyānā cha brāhmaṇā*, suggesting that the *pardah* ladies, children (*lit.*, boys), servants and Brāhmins represented the principal inmates of an aristocratic household. The Vidhūrapaṇḍita Jāṭaka means wives and sons (*puttā cha dārā*) by *orodhā* and *kumārā*, and servants and maid servants (*dāsī-dāsā*) by *vesiyānā*. In a royal household only those among the *pardah* ladies who were formally married princesses passed as *devis* as a rule. The grown up princes as well as sons of aristocratic families had their separate domestic establishments either within or outside the parental residence. The omission of *dārakas* in R.E. V is significant. His daughters, if any, are simply ignored in the inscriptions. The Pali legend (Samanta-pāsādikā, I) makes us believe that about the time of Aśoka's conversion to Buddhism there were 16,000 opera girls serving, as concubines (*nāṭakittiyo*) in Aśoka's household besides his chief queen Asandhimittā. The term *orodha* denoted all the womenfolk of the royal household headed by the chief queen, including their little children and maid-servants. It is said of Aśoka in the Mahāvamsa (V. 184) that on the first day of formal consecration of the Asokārāma he came there together with his *orodha*, together with his councillors, and surrounded by his large army (*sahorodho saha-machcho baloghaparivārīto*).

16. *bhātinaṃ cha me bhagininaṃ cha e vā pi aṃne nātike*: Here reference is to the household of Aśoka's brothers, sisters and other kith and kin. It shows that Aśoka had brothers and sisters more than one, if not several; precisely how many, it does not indicate. The legends except one in Pali are reticent about his sisters. According to the Pali Chronicles, prince Agnibrahmā, husband of Saṅghamitrā, was Aśoka's nephew (*bhāginēyyo*, sister's son, Mahāvamsa, V. 169). As regards his brothers, Mookerji (Asoka, p. 2 f.) rightly observes: "Ceylon tradition (as narrated in the Dīpavamsa and the Mahāvamsa) makes Bindusāra the husband of sixteen wives and father of 101 sons, of whom only three are named, viz., Sumana (Susīma according to the northern legends),



the eldest, Aśoka, and Tishya (uterine brother of Asoka), the youngest son. The mother of Asoka in the northern tradition is Subhadrāṅgī, the beautiful daughter of a Brahman of Champā, who bore Bindusāra another son named Vigatāśoka (Vītaśoka), and not Tishya of the Ceylon books." Dhammapāla in his Theragāthā-Commentary, as pointed out by Mr. C. D. Chatterji, distinguishes between the two brothers of Aśoka, viz., Tissa and Vītasoka (wrongly spelt Vītāsoka). The question is—how many of his brothers were alive when the edict in question was promulgated or does the statement in the edict falsify the Buddhist legends representing him as a fratricide? The Divyāvadāna which does not mention the total number of Bindusāra's sons, describes the war of succession as one between the two brothers, Susīma and Aśoka, while the Pali legends that give the total number, describe it as one "between Asoka on one side, and a coalition of all his 98 (half) brothers who made a common cause with their eldest brother Sumana, the *yuvarāja*, and hence the *lawful heir* to the throne." The two legends agree in stating that his uterine brother Tishya or Vītaśoka alone was alive during his reign. According to Tāranātha, Aśoka killed only six brothers. If there be any substance of truth in these three traditions, and if the fact be that none but his uterine brother were spared, he could not have spoken of his brothers. But here he is concerned, not with his brothers but only with their households. The issue may be discussed on the evidence of other edicts, viz., P.E. VII, S.R.E. I, and M.R.E. (Si, Bra, Ja). In the first, Aśoka speaks of his sons (*dālakānam*) and other *devikumālas*; in the second, of *Kumālas* as Viceroys stationed at Tosali, Takasilā, and Ujeni; and in the third, of the *Ayaputa* stationed at Suvāṃnagiri. In the first, the force of the expression, "of my sons as well as of other *devikumāras*" is that Aśoka's own sons, too, are to be counted among the princes of the blood royal. The same is to be inferred from Kauṭilya's use of the expression *devikumārāḥ* in relation to the reigning king's cognates and sons (Arthaśāstra, V. 6), sons and brothers (*ibid*, IX. 3). Here, too, the force of the expression "other" or "any other" is that the king's sons and brothers were counted among the *devikumāras*. But Mookerji misconstrues the position of Aśoka's *dāra* when he (Asoka, p. 9) takes them to be "the sons of a lower status called *dālakas* from the status of their mothers" as distinguished from "four princes serving as Viceroys in four different and remote provinces, and designated as *Kumāras* or *Āryaputras*." According to P.E. VII, his sons were the *devikumāras* in order of preference, the *dāra* or *putas* in an endearing term having been mentioned as typical of princes of the blood royal. Mookerji upholds the view of Bühler in whose interpretation the *devikumālas*, or princes (*lit.*, "queens' sons") "were not the sons of Asoka's queens or *devīs*, but of the queens and *devīs* of his father, and were hence his step-brothers (E.I., II, p. 276; Asoka, p. 191). Not necessarily so, for, according to the Arthaśāstra, the reigning king's sons, brothers, and others were to be counted among the princes of the blood. His brothers' sons, sisters' sons, and daughters' sons, too, were entitled to pass as *devikumāras*.



M.R.E. (Si) and S.R.E. I lead us to distinguish between the *Ayaputa* (*Āryaputra*) and the three *Kumālas*. In the opinion of Fleet the former 'was a vice-regent who represented king Aśoka for some time.' Bhandarkar (*Aśoka*, p. 56 f.) not only upholds this view but argues: "[The Minor Rock Edict] was issued when Aśoka was with the Buddhist Saṃgha and visiting the different places of pilgrimage. It thus seems that *Āryaputra* here denotes the *Yuvarāja* or crown-prince who carried on the administration during the temporary absence of Aśoka from his capital. It further seems that this *Yuvarāja* was stationed at Suvarṇagiri in Rājagṛiha, the old capital of Magadha, just as the *Yuvarāja* of the imperial Gupta dynasty was posted at Vaiśālī, the old capital of the Lichchhavis, from whom practically the Guptas received sovereignty. The language, again, of the preamble of the Mysore copies is almost exactly the same as that of a Nāsik Cave Inscription in which Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi issues an order to his *amātya* at Govardhana. The former was the ruler, and similarly the *Āryaputra-Mahāmātras* of the Mysore edicts, being the vice-regent, formed naturally the ruling authority for the time being at least." As for literary usages, he draws attention to the Khaṇḍahāla Jātaka in which the word *ayyaputta* signifies 'a prince', to the Vinaya Mahāvagga (VI) which supplies an exception in the sense that here the courtesan addresses the Lichchhavis who were rather *rājans* or rulers than *rājakumāras* or princes as *Ayyaputtā*, and to the Svapna-Vāsavadattā of Bhāsa in which the Vatsa king Udayana has been thrice addressed as *Āryaputra*. I differ. In the Vinaya Mahāvagga the Lichchhavis addressed as *Ayyaputtā* are described as *dahara* or young, youthful. As Gaṇapati Śāstri points out (*Pratimā-nāṭaka*, Introd., p. 32), in the Svapna-nāṭaka of Bhāsa, the Chamberlain of Vāsavadattā's father respectfully addresses king Udayana as *Āryaputra*, and that appropriately because Udayana was really in the rôle of a prince when he was in Avantī with the intention of marrying princess Vāsavadattā. We need not be astonished that in the Bālacharita attributed to Bhāsa, a *Bhaṭa* addresses Vasudeva as *Āryaputra* (*vide* Raychaudhuri's *op. cit.*, p. 261). In the Vessantara Jātaka when the subking Vessantara refers to his father, he refers to him as *ayyaka* or *Ārya* (*ayyakassa me=mayham pituno*), while his wife addresses him as *Ayyaputta* or son of her father-in-law. Accordingly if the preamble of M.R.E. (Si) be in the official language of Pāṭaliputra, the term *Ayaputa* must be taken to mean one of his brothers, and if it be in the official language of Suvarṇagiri, it must be taken to mean one of his sons. The greater probability lies on the side of the first alternative. There was no hill at Rājagṛiha known at that time by the name of Suvarṇagiri to justify Bhandarkar's location. There is nothing in M.R.E. to indicate that Aśoka had to appoint a vice-regent for the time being to enable him to visit the different places of pilgrimage. The only place visited by him in the 10th regnal year was Budhgayā which was not very distant either. As for the *Kumāras* as Viceroys the presumption must be in favour of Aśoka's own sons, the *rājakumāras*. In its favour one may cite such historical instances as the appointment of Bimbisāra as Viceroy of Aṅga



by his father Bhattiya, the appointment of Kuṇika-Ajātaśatru as Viceroy of Aṅga by his father Bimbisāra, and the appointment of Aśoka as his father's viceroy in Avantī (the designation implied in the expression *Avanti-ratṭham bhuñjanto pitarā dinnam attano*, *Mahāvamsa*, VIII. 8 and *pitarā dinnam rajjam Ujjeniyam*, *Mahāvamsa*, V. 39). The Divyāvadāna instances the case by the fact of deputation of Aśoka by his father as his personal representative to Takshaṣilā to quell the revolt against the mal-administration of his brother Susīma. The legends concerning Aśoka's sons, too, favour this presumption, e.g., the Divyāvadāna story of deputation of Kuṇāla by Aśoka as his personal representative to Takshaṣilā to quell a revolt among the subjects; Kalhaṇa's mention of Jalauka as Aśoka's son and successor in Kāśmīra; and Tāranātha's mention of Virasena as Aśoka's son and successor in Gandhāra. Referring to the 4th year of Aśoka's *abhiseka*, the *Mahāvamsa* (V. 171, 201-2) tells us that the *Uparājā* prince Tissa who was Aśoka's uterine brother having renounced the world, the king proposed to appoint his sister's son and son-in-law Aggibrahmā as the crown prince, and he, too, having been inclined to a life of renunciation, the offer went at last to his son Mahinda who for the same reason declined it. What happened after that the Chronicles do not say. The impression left behind is that the post went abegging. But it is evident from the *Mahāvamsa* alone (Ch. V) that Aśoka's mother, queens, brother's wife, married daughter passed as *devis*, and brother, son, brother's son, and sister's son were entitled to the designation of *Kumāra*, in which case it is difficult to say whom the king had actually meant by the three *Kumāras*. On the other hand, Mookerji (*Asoka*, p. 124) opines, "At any rate, the princes of his inscriptions whom he refers to as his viceroys need not be taken to be all his sons"; he would rather take them to be all his brothers (*Asoka*, pp. 6, 144), and argue his case thus on the assumption, no doubt, that S.R.E. I is earlier in date than the Fourteen Rock series: "*Kumāras* or *Āryaputras*, princes of the royal family, were posted as viceroys or governors in the cities mentioned, viz., Ujjayinī, Takshaṣilā, Tosali and Suvarṇagiri, but these princes are not mentioned as being Asoka's sons. Where Asoka refers to his own sons and descendants, he uses the expression like *putrā cha potrā cha prapotrā cha Devānaṃpriyasa* ... as in R.E. IV, Girnar, or *me putrā potā cha prapotrā cha* in R.E. VI, *ib.* Thus the princes that are referred to here as viceroys must be taken to be Asoka's brothers, and not his sons. That one of his brothers named Tissa was appointed as his viceroy in 270 B.C., and continued as such up to 266 B.C., we know from the *Mahāvamsa* (v. 33, 171). According to Asokan chronology as worked out [by Mookerji], the date of this edict [S.R.E. I] would be 259 B.C. when Asoka would be 45 years, but not the father of so many sons old enough to be his viceroy. The only known son was Mahendra, but he became a monk as early as 264 B.C..... The other known son of Asoka who was appointed as his viceroy and posted to Taxila is Kuṇāla according to the Divyāvadāna, but the date of his birth is worked out to be 263 B.C. and



of his appointment as Viceroy at Taxila, 235 B.C. No doubt Asoka might have one or two sons who in 257 B.C. were eligible for viceroyalty, taking the minimum viceregal age for viceroyalty to be 18, at which age Asoka himself was sent out by his father 'as his viceroy to Ujjayinī.'

Mookerji's finding is in some sense or other all right, but the argument on which it is based is faulty. It is not quite correct to say that in R.E. IV, and VI Asoka spoke of the present state of things when he expressed a certain wish of his with reference to his sons, grandsons, great-grandsons, and other descendants after them, in short, *pajā* or 'progeny,' 'offspring' (R.E. V) until the destruction of the existing world-system. The statement in R.E. XIII to the effect: *putā papotā me asu*, "(whosoever) may be my sons (and) great-grandsons" clearly shows that here Asoka was thinking of what should come to pass after his death, and not in his life-time. All these statements were intended to convey the same sense as the phrase *putāpapotika* or *chāmdama-suliyika* in P.E. VII and Sānchi Pillar Edict. No inference should be drawn from these except that when the edicts concerned were promulgated Asoka had every possibility of having a long line of successors through sons, grandsons and great-grandsons. When he spoke of his *orodhas* and of those of his brothers and sisters and other kith and kin in R.E. V, he made no mention of his *dālakas* nor of other *devikumālas*. Thus in R.E. V he kept in view only elderly persons ranking with him in domestic relationship, while in P.E. VII they pass out of consideration and the younger generation of princes of the blood royal ranking with his sons come into importance. The situation changed in an interval of 13 years between the date of promulgation of R.E. V and that of P.E. VII. In between the two one must place the Queen's Edict which introduces us to his second queen Kāluvāki and her son Tīvala. He had his first queen, the queen consort whom the Pali legend calls Asandhimittā, and probably sons by her, but neither she nor her sons find mention in the inscriptions. The Pali tradition is untrustworthy in so far as it tends to create the impression that the Vaiśya lady Devī was the only wife of Asoka, while he was the viceroy or provincial ruler of Avantī. He must then have his *orodha* consisting of his wives and children and left-handed wives and children. According to Pali legend (Samanta-pāsādikā, I; Mahāvamsa, V. 85-86), his *orodha* up till the fourth year of his *abhiseka* consisted of his chief queen Asandhimittā and sixteen thousand singing women (*aggamahesī* Asandhimittā, *soḷasa-nāṭakittiyo*). This was presumably his *orodha* at Ujjeni, the official headquarters of the province of Avantī, besides one at Vidisā where his Vaiśya wife Devī resided. Thus if he were appointed by his father as his viceroy for Avantī when he was eighteen years old, it is not impossible that he had sons even at the time of his accession or coronation eligible for viceroyalty. But the real state of things is not disclosed to us. In the matter of appointment of crown princes and viceroys in a monarchical constitution the sons of the reigning monarch got preference as a rule. The early Indian inscriptions do not



supply any exception to this rule, literary tradition does. The Jātakas preserve several instances of appointment of younger brothers as *uparājas* or crown princes. According to Buddhist legends of Aśoka, his younger uterine brother was at first appointed as crown prince. The Pali tradition goes to show that the vacant post was offered successively to his nephew (sister's son) and son-in-law, and son. Thus princes of the collateral lines, too, were eligible for the post. Kauṭilya, too, prescribes : (a) "cognates, princes and other chiefs of the royal family may be employed in works such as the capture of a chief who, employed as a commander of a fort or the tracts of wilderness, has turned inimical along with a strong band of supporters ; or they may be sent on an expedition full of difficulties ; or to visit the family of the king's friend" (Shamasastri's Transl. p. 283); (b) "When a son, or a brother, or any other person of the royal family attempts to seize the kingdom, he should be won over by holding out hopes ; when this is not possible, he should be conciliated by allowing him to enjoy what he has already seized ; or by making an agreement with him ; . . . . ."  
(*Ibid*, p. 375).

The households of Aśoka and those of his brothers, sisters and other kith and kin, situated at Pāṭaliputra and in outlying towns, are mentioned in R.E. V in connection with the distribution of charities ; and the same as to his sons and other princes of the blood royal as mentioned in P.E. VII. Unless his brothers were then alive, at least some of them, and held important positions, it would be difficult to account for the prominence accorded to them. It is very likely that in the earlier part of his reign, they and those among the nearest relations ranking with them acted as the trusted personal representatives and high official agents, while during the latter part they were replaced by his sons and other princes of the blood royal ranking with them, the *Kumāra* viceroys of S.R.E. I having been mostly, if not all, his sons. It is, of course, quite possible to speak of the households of one's brothers even when they are all dead and gone. What is more probable under the circumstances is that at the time of promulgation of R.E. V his brothers were still the recognised heads of their households, and not their sons.

#### As to R. E. VI :-

1. *vachasi, vrachaspi* : The Aśokan term *vacha* or *vracha* is the Prakrit equivalent of either S. *vraja* or *varchas*. In the Shahbazgarhi text of R.E. VI, the verbal form *vracheyam*, a variant of *gachheyam*, *yeham*, leaves no room for doubt that *vracha*=*vraja* (to go). Again in R.E. XII, we have mention of *vrachabhūmikas* as a class of high officials who along with the *Dharmamahāmātras* and *Stryadhyaksha mahāmātras*, and others were employed to encourage tolerance among different religious sects. Here, too, *vracha* is obviously=*vraja*.



R.E.VI speaks of five items of personal enjoyment in the daily life of the king, of five occasions when he was expected to observe privacy and not to attend to state affairs. All but the first are stated in terms of structure or space, and the first alone, *bhujjamānasa*, "while eating," in terms of time. But in Aśoka's statement we have a good corroboration of Alexander's philosophy maintaining that there can be no idea of time which does not involve the idea of space, and *vice versa*. In Aśoka's case, the expression *savām kālām*, "all times," implies the idea of *savata*, "everywhere," and *vice versa*. Thus to say "while I am taking my meal" is the same as to say "when I am in the dining hall" (*bhojana-sālā*).

The *bhojana-sālā* (dining-hall) was a distinct structure of the royal palace. So were the *orodha* (*antaḥpura*, closed female apartment), the *gabhāgāra* (bed-chamber), and the *vacha* or *vracha*. Up to *vracha* the king must be supposed to have been within the precincts of the palace. The *vinīta* was the conveyance carrying him to the *uyāna* or pleasance, while the *uyāna* itself lay somewhere outside the palace and at some distance from it. What was, then, *vracha*? Some of the later Sanskrit lexicons suggests *nāṭaka*, "opera", "dramatic performance", as a synonym of *vrachas*. This would very well suit the Aśokan context (*ante*, p. 35, f.n. 4), but unfortunately the synonym is not supported by any known literary use. On the other hand, the Aśokan texts compel us to equate *vracha* with *vraja*. In Bengal, the name *yātrā* which may be construed as synonym of *vraja* is applied to the dramatic performances without scenic effect. The Ardhamaṅgadhi *vachcha* is equated with Sk. *vratyā*, *muṇi ti vachche*, a sage is to be known by his religious practice. Accepting this equation, one might explain the Aśokan word *vrachaspi* as meaning "when I am engaged in the performance of a daily religious duty." But this does not tally with other items of royal enjoyment (*upabhoga*), and *vachcha* cannot be taken to signify a structure or something spatial. There is a suggestion to the effect that *vracha* may be taken to mean "the latrine", but the Pali word for latrine is *vachcha-kuṭi*, and there is also no literary usage to justify the rendering of *vrachaspi* by "when I am obeying the call of nature." Further, the very idea of attending to the people's business even from the latrine is not only far-fetched but gruesome. *Vraja* equated with *vraja* offers us a choice between the walk, the mews, and the enclosure (*Giribaja*, *Girivraja* being=*Giri-parikkhepa*). The walk and the enclosure may be connected together in the rendering: "when I am in the palace enclosure for a walk." As for the mews, going by the prescription in the Arthashastra, one might suggest when the king went to inspect the elephants, horses, chariots and infantry and to circumambulate the cow with a suckling calf and the bull. I prefer 'promenade' implying the king's private walk within the palace compound, being entertained by music of the *ganikās* and watching the playful behaviour of beasts and birds. The promenade might also serve as the place from which the king mounted the *vinīta* (chariot, elephant or horse). The close correspondence between the



Jātaka list of five royal *upabhogas* and the Aśokan enumeration of six such occasions creates undoubtedly a strong presumption in favour of taking *vracha* somehow or other to refer to the opera house or entertainment hall of the royal palace.

2. *vinītamhi, vinītasi* : The word *vinīta* means, according to Mookerji, "religious exercise." He takes the locative form of the word to mean when "Aśoka would study Vinaya in his Vinīta" instead of "*svādhyāya* or worship of Agni." He argues his case thus (Asoka, p. 145 f.): "I adopt the meaning of Senart, in accordance with which the idea that all these words single out the different places with which are associated the different functions of his domestic and private life, viz., eating, sleeping, company of females, walking about in the gardens (*udyānesu*) or his farm, and last but not least important for Aśoka, his religious exercise. In this edict, Aśoka declares that public life has, however, the right, and can pursue him even into his home, and leisure and privacy. Some scholars (Vidhusekhara, I.A. xlix, p. 53, and Ojha) take *vraja* to mean a short journey, and *vinīta*, a long one, involving a succession of conveyances and relays of horses, *paramparāvāhana*, as Amarakosha puts it). Prof. Vidhusekhara cites an apt passage from the Rathavinīta Sutta of Majjhima Nikāya where it is stated that for King Pasenadi's journey on urgent business from Sāvattthi to Sāketa, seven *ratha-vinītas* (lit., 'the chariots to which are yoked the horses that are well-trained and of good race' (Buddhaghosa). . . . It may be noted that Kauṭilya (II, 33) mentions a class of chariots called *vainayika* or training chariots. I still adhere to my own meaning which is supported by Kauṭilya's statement of the king's duties which included *svādhyāya* (religious study), evening prayers (*sandhyām upāsīta*), and receiving benedictions from preceptors, etc., and solitary meditation (*śāstramiti kartavyatām chintayet*), for which the *vinīta*, the place for such religious duties, was necessary. Kauṭilya and the edict agree in other points, too, e.g., *orodhana* of the edict corresponding to *śayīta* of Kauṭilya; *bhumjamānasa* to *snānabhojana*; *udyānesu* to *svairavihāra*; and *vraja*, which is implied in the king's inspection of his horses, elephants, chariots and infantry . . . . Corresponding to *vinīta*, Kauṭilya also refers to *upasthāna* (sanctuary) and *Agnyāgāra* (room of sacred fire), where the king with his preceptors would deal with religious and other matters (Kauṭilya, I. 19)." Against Dr. Mookerji, I may point out that the correspondence between Kauṭilya and the edict is not so close as that between the Jātaka (V, p. 506 f.) and the edict, the very order of *upabhogas*, and not of duties, being the same :

1) <i>bhojana</i>	>	< <i>bhumjamāna</i> ;
2) <i>kilesa</i>	>	< <i>orodha</i> ;
3) <i>sayana</i>	>	< <i>gabhāgāra</i> ;
4) <i>turiya</i>	>	< <i>vacha</i> (?) ;
5) <i>uyyāna</i>	>	< <i>vinīta, uyyāna</i> .



He has not been able to cite any authority whatever to establish that the word *vinīta* was ever employed in the sense of a place for religious or any other training. The word *vinīta* usually means 'the well-trained', and the adjective 'well-trained' is applicable to any vehicle or conveyance, chariot, horse or elephant. And we have actually the technical term *ratha-vinīta* in Pali to denote 'a well-trained chariot', i.e., 'a chariot to which are yoked the horses that are well-trained and of good breed' (*vinīta-assa-yutto ratho*), as Buddhaghosa defines it. By *vinīta* we are not to think of a relay drive of well-trained chariots, which is not permitted by the text of the edict. The idea of a relay drive is clear, no doubt, from the Pali description of Pasenadi's journey from Sāvattthi to Sāketa, and back by means of seven *rathavinītas*. The edict speaks of a single drive to the pleasure-garden, and the well-trained vehicle which might be either a chariot, or a horse, or an elephant. The Dhammachetiya Sutta of the Majjhima Nikāya gives an account of king Pasenadi's chariot drive to Naṅgaraka, the Kosala Saṃyutta of king Pasenadi's going out of the city of Sāvattthi on the back of an elephant, and the Sāmaññaphala Sutta of the Dīgha Nikāya of king Ajātasattu's visit to Jīvaka's mango-grove by a processional ride on elephants. The *vinīta* of the edict implies not exactly a long journey but a drive or trip to the pleasure outside the palace area, may be in the suburb of the city. Similarly the *vacha* of the edict does not imply a short journey; it may at the most imply a gentle walk within the palace compound.

3. *dāpakam vā srāvāpakam vā* : Hitherto translated by "a donation or a proclamation." According to Mookerji (Asoka, p. 147), the *dāpaka* is exemplified by the inscriptions recording Aśoka's grant of cave dwellings to the Ājivikas, and the *srāvāpaka* by the M.R.E. embodying his *sāvāpita sāvaṇa*. Ojha in his Hindi edition of the edicts, suggests that "the two words [*dāpaka* and *srāvāpaka*] might mean the officers connected with the royal benefactions (the Almoners), and with the proclamations of the royal messages." The Arthaśāstra (II. 7) mentions the *dāpaka* as one of the subordinate officers who fixed and collected the amount of taxes payable by the *dāyaka* or tax-payer. In some of the Copper-plate grants of the Gupta Age we have mention of the *Ājñā-dāpaka* as an officer who gave the order for making the grant in question. The *srāvāpaka* as an official designation is not found elsewhere. At first sight, *dāpakam* and *srāvāpakam* are each in apposition with *yaṁ* in *ya(m) kiṁchī mukhato āñāpayāmi*. But the causative verb *āñāpayāmi* has two objects, viz., *yaṁ* and *dāpakam srāvāpakam*. In the next clause, too, we have two objects in *ya āchāyike* and *mahāmātresu*. Thus the statement is in favour of treating *dāpaka* and *srāvāpaka* as officers.

4. *ya kiṁchī mukhato āñāpayāmi svayaṁ* : "whatsoever order I myself verbally give." This indicates that the king under the Maurya constitution



as it prevailed in Aśoka's time was the source from which the official orders emanated and were issued, and that these were issued at first orally or verbally. But these were subject to discussion in the *Parisā*. In commenting on the king's right and power to issue such orders expecting that these will be obeyed, Jayaswal (Hindu Polity, II, p. 146 f.) cites the authority of the *Śukranītisāra*, II. 291, 292, according to which :

*alekhyasājñāpayati hyalekhyam yat karoti yah |*  
*rājakṛityam ubhau chorau tau bhṛitya-nṛipatī sadā || 291*  
*nṛipa-saṁchihnitam lekhyam nṛipas tan na nṛipo nṛipah | 292*

"A king or an officer who orders or does a business of state without a *lekhyā* (official document) are both thieves at all times."

"The document signed and sealed by the king is the king and not the king himself."

And he characteristically observes : "As a written *lekhyā* became really the order of the Ministry on account of the routine, a king who wanted his personal orders to be observed must take recourse to oral commands and requests. And when an oral command was issued, according to the constitution implied here, the officers had to deal with the command of a thief in law, and to the anointed king in flesh and blood trouble was a certain consequence. We have, thanks to the inscriptions of Aśoka, an immortal evidence of this trouble. Aśoka issued orders regarding his proclamations and sermons (*sāvakaṁ*) and gifts (*dāpakaṁ*), and the *Parisā* (Council) discussed the orders and shelved them. The angry monarch orders that he should be informed when his oral orders are rejected."

The weak point in Jayaswal's argument is that he argues back from the *Śukranītisāra*, a very late work, to prove his case. There is nothing in Aśoka's statement in R.E. VI to indicate that either he was angry or he had reason to be so from rejection of his verbal orders by the Council of Ministers. The idea of rejection is based upon a misinterpretation of the Aśokan term *nijhati* (vide note on *Parisā* below). It was no easy task in the absence of easily available writing materials in Aśoka's time to issue a written order sealed by the king. The whole of Indian literature was being orally handed down at this time. Writing was sparingly used, as convincingly shown by the late Professor Rhys Davids (Buddhist India, Ch. VI), for the official purpose only. The *lipikāra* of Aśoka was not precisely the *lekha* of the Arthaśāstra ; he was the engraver of letters in clay, wood or stone, and not a writer with ink on birch bark, palm leaves, or pieces of leather and paper. The whole atmosphere is still that of verbal communication, and that is breathed by Aśoka's inscriptions that abound with the expressions *vataviyā*, "should be told" (S.R.E. I, II, Queen's Edict); *vuchati tesam*, "should be verbally explained to them"; etc. He speaks indeed of *ikā lipī*, "a copy of the document" in the Sārnāth copy of the Schism Pillar Edict, but here the copy means a copy of the inscription incised on a piece



of wood or stone. He was the supreme authority of the administration to instruct or direct the high officials, the *mahāmātras* everywhere, as to how to record the donations made by his second queen (Queen's Edict), how to broadcast his proclamations (M.R.E., Ye), and how to communicate his wishes to his *Rajjukas* (P.E. IV). In the two Separate Rock Edicts he boldly states, either addressing the City Judiciaries or the Viceroy-in-Council: "Whatsoever I perceive (as good), that I wish, intending—I would fulfil (it) by action and achieve by definite means. And this is considered by me to be the chief means (namely), that which in this matter is the instruction to you." This could not have been the statement of a monarch if he were not conscious of his absolute power. The position of the Ministry was not so much stabilised then as to curb his personal authority in the matter of administration and administrative changes. He lionised the entire field. If the Ministry played any part, it was a minor one,—the second fiddle.

5. *vivādo nijhatī vā* : "a dispute or an amendment" (Hultsch); "a division of opinion or total rejection" (Jayaswal); "a debate or deliberation" (Mookerji); "opposition or argumentation" (Bhandarkar). I prefer "difference or agreement." With Bühler *nijhati* is "fraud", with Lüders and F. W. Thomas "adjournment", with Jayaswal "total rejection" (*nikshapti*), and with Woolner "meditation" (*nidhyapti*), reconsideration, adjournment or appeal". Mookerji and Bhandarkar have admittedly accepted the technical sense of *nijhati*, Pali *nijjhatti*, suggested by me in 1928. The Sanskrit phonetic equivalent of *nijhati* is *nidhyapti*, and not *nikshapti*. In the Pali Nikāyas, Majjhima, I, Kosambika Sutta, and Aṅguttara, I, Parisavagga, precisely as in R.E. VI, the word *nijjhatti* occurs in connection with *vivāda* in a *Parisā* (*ante*, p. 38). In both the contexts, the two words, *vivāda* and *nijjhatti* signify two opposite states of things, whether of disagreement in views or of agreement after proper deliberations, after a sober consideration of different points of view reasonably stated by each member of the Council or Assembly. Buddhaghosa explains the word *vivāda* as meaning *viruddho vādo*, "contradictory or contrary views", and defines the term *nijjhatti* as *atthañ cha kāraṇaṇ cha dassetvā aññamaññaṇ jānāpanaṇ*, 'making the points of view known to one another by stating facts and reasons'. The Aṅguttara Nikāya, iv, p. 223 records the Buddha's pronouncement: *ujjhattibalā bālā, nijjhattibalā paṇḍitā*, making mention of two other *balas* or capacities in the sequel, namely, *paṭisaṃkhāna* (= *pachchavekkhana*, reviewing, revising, reconsidering), and *khanti* (= *adhivāsana*, enduring, forbearing). Here *nijjhatti* stands as an antithesis to *ujjhatti* which Buddhaghosa defines thus: *yaṃ asuko idaṇ cha idaṇ cha āha maṃ so āha, na aññaṇ ti evaṃ ujjhānaṇ*, "that which this man said to me, this and that, not to any other person,—an outcry like this." In this context the Pali scholiast defines *nijjhatti* as: *na idaṇ etaṇ nāma' etaṇ ti atthānattha-nijjhāpanaṇ*,



"making the other side consider a fact and that which is not a fact, pointing out—the matter is not that, it is this." Here we are to think not so much of the process of the debate or deliberation as of the final result of it, of the actual condition which has come to prevail, as suggested by the verb *santo*, *santam* which cannot be equated with Pali *santo*, 'the tranquil', as in the Dhammapada verse *santo have pavedayanti*. The word *nijhati* occurs also in P.E. VII as signifying one of the two means of promoting the cause of piety, and its verbal forms *nijhapayisanti* and *nijhapayitave* in P.E. IV, in a different technical sense.

6. *mahāmātresu* : "to the Mahāmātras", lit., "among the Mahāmātras." Here they are introduced in connection with the entrusting of certain urgent state business which is not specified. All the high officials of Aśoka appear to have borne the common designation of *Mahāmāta*, *Mahāmatta* or *Mahāmātra* which literally means 'one of great measure,' 'a magnate'. The Vinaya Suttavibhaṅga (Bhikkhu-vibhaṅga, I. 2) mentions the *Pathabyārājā* (King Overlord), the *Padesarājā* (Monarch of a particular kingdom), the *Maṇḍalikā* (Subkings), the *Antarabhogikā* (Chiefs of buffer-states), the *Akkhadassā* (Judges), and the *Mahāmattā* (*Mahāmātras*) in the list of ruling authorities, persons vested with royal powers (*vājāno*). A similar gradation of rulers, ministers and officers is met with in the Amarakosha, Kshatriyavarga, which, however, distinguishes between the *Mantrins*, *Dhīsachivas* (= *Matisachivas*) and *Karmasachivas*, on the one hand, and the *Mahāmātras* as *pradhānas* or departmental heads, on the other. In P.E. VII, too, the *Mahāmātras* are bodily distinguished as *mukhas* (*mukhyas*) or heads of departments. As Mookerji (Asoka, p. 107) points out, in the Arthasāstra, "the *Mahāmātra* figures as a minister (I. 10, 12, 13), and as the chief executive officer of a city under the title *Nāgarika-mahāmātra* (IV. 5), while his power and influence will be evident from the fact that the seditious *mahāmātra* is a cause of much concern to the king." In the Mahābhārata, the *Mahāmātra* appears in the rôle of a warrior seated on the back of an elephant, i.e., as a *hastipakādhīpa* in the language of Dharaṇi. Just as in the Arthasāstra (II. 5), so in the Vinaya Piṭaka and the Amarakosha, the *Mahāmātras* are distinguished from the Judges (*Dharmasthas*, *Akshadarśas*). According to the Arthasāstra (II. 5), the *Dharmasthas* and the *Mahāmātras* had their offices in buildings called *Dharmasthīya* and *Mahāmātriya* respectively. It is still undecided whether or not the *Rajjukas* corresponding in some respects to the *Dharmasthas* of Kauṭilya are kept distinct altogether in the edicts from the *Mahāmātras*. Buddhaghosa defines the *Mahāmātras* as *ṭhānantarapattā mahā-amachchā*, "the great officials occupying different ranks and posted to different places." He explains the designation as implying either *Magadharatṭhe Mahāmatto mahatīyā issariyamattāya samannāgato*, "the great official in the kingdom of Magadha, vested with a large measure of royal power", or *Magadha-rañño Mahāmachcho*, "the highest officer of the Magadha king."



(Samanta-pāsādikā, Dutiya Pārājikā-vaṇṇanā). In point of fact, the *Magadha-mahāmatta* is the epithet applied in Pali to Varshakāra who was a Brahmin chief minister of king Ajātasatru of Magadha (Dīgha-N., II, p. 72 f.).

In Pali literature, the designation *Mahāmatta* alternates with *Mahāmachcha*, Sk. *Mahāmātya*; it generally occurs in association with the rulers of Magadha, Bimbisāra and Ajātasatru, and rarely in connection with the ruler of Kōśala, king Prasenajit. It is conspicuous by its absence from the Past Anecdotes of the Pali Jātakas including the *gāthās*. The designation has enjoyed prominence in the inscriptions of Aśoka in which he has passed as the Magadha or Magadhan king (*lājā Māgadhe, Bhabru Edict*). As regards later Indian inscriptions, it certainly occurs in two inscriptions of the Śātavāhana and Scythian period (Lüders' List, Nos. 937, 1144), and doubtfully only in the Sohghaura Copperplate: *Savatiyanam mahamatanam* (of or for the *Mahāmātras* of *Śrāvastī*) as I read it (Annals of Bhand. Or. Res. Inst., xi, i, 1930). The designation *Rajjuka*, too, as noted by Raychaudhuri (*op. cit.*, pp. 431, 436), is met with in two other inscriptions of the same period (Lüders' List, Nos. 416, 1195).

The Pali Canonical texts familiarise us with the following official designations (cf. F. W. Thomas, J.R.A.S., 1914, p. 389):

(1) *Mantino Mahāmattā* (Kosala-saṃyutta, III, 5), the *Mahāmātras* as ministers, the two Brahmin Magadha *Mahāmātras*, mentioned in the Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta, being no other than *Mantri-mahāmātras*;

(2) *Sabbatthaka-mahāmattā* (Vinaya Mahāvagga, VI), the *Mahāmātras* "in charge of general affairs" (Raychaudhuri, *op. cit.*, p. 168);

(3) *Vohārika-mahāmattā* (Vinaya Chullavagga, VI), the *Mahāmātras* as administrators of justice;

(4) *Senānāyaka-mahāmattā* (Vinaya Mahāvagga, I), the *Mahāmātras* as generals;

(5) *Gaṇaka-mahāmattā* (Lakkhaṇa-Suttanta, Dīgha III), the *Mahāmātras* as accountants;

and (6) *Antepura-upachārakā Mahāmattā* (Vinaya Chullavagga, VII), the *Mahāmātras* in charge of the inner apartments of the royal palace, obviously the same as *Orodha-mahāmattā* associated with the home-guard (*balakāya*): *orodha-mahāmatta-balakāyādisu* (Papañchasūdanī, under Raṭṭhapāla Sutta). Buddhaghosa in his Papañchasūdanī (Raṭṭhapāla Sutta), speaks of the *Mahāmātras*, the *Mahāraṭṭhikas* and such other higher and higher classes of officials (*Mahāmatta-Mahāraṭṭhikādīnam uggatuggatam eva parisam gahetvā*).

With reference to the judicial system of the Vṛjji-Lichchhavis, Buddhaghosa (Sumangala-vilāsinī, II, p. 517 f.) mentions the *Vinichchhaya-mahāmattā* or *Mahāmātras* as Judicial Investigators of the causes of action and places them immediately below the *Vohārikas* or Judges who are experts in legal procedures.

The *Mahāmātras* of R.E. VI to whom Aśoka verbally entrusted the urgent state business in connection whereof the *Parisā* had to meet for discussion were



evidently *Mantri-mahāmātras* or *Mahāmātras* as ministers. Kauṭilya, too, speaks, in connexion with an urgent state-business (*ātyayike kārye*) of the *Mantrins* and the *Mantri-parishad*. The *Mahāmātras* associated with the *Āryaputra* (M.R.E., Si) and the *Kumāras* (S.R.E. I) should be put in the same category as regards the four outlying provinces. Like the Emperor, the Viceroys, too, appear to have each a Council of Ministers to assist him in state affairs. The *Mahāmātras* placed in charge of the administration of *Samāpā* are distinctly called *Mahāmāmātā Lājavachanikā*, (S.R.E. II, J), the *Mahāmātras* as Commissioners who must have formed a Board (*Vagam*). They are simply called *Lājavachanikā* in S.R.E. I (J). The *Mahāmātras* placed in charge of the administration of *Isila* who were evidently in the position of *Lājavachanikas*, are simply called *Mahāmātā* (M.R.E., Si, Bra, Ja). There were similar state-functionaries under the Viceroys stationed at *Takkasilā* and *Ujjeni*, as also under the Emperor himself (S.R.E. I). Those under the Central Government were to go forth on tours of inspection every five years, and those under the Provincial Governments were not to exceed three years (S.R.E. I).

We have express mention of bodies of *Mahāmātras* as City-judiciaries, *Mahāmātā Nagala-viyohālakā*, or simply, *Nagala-viyohālakā* (S.R.E. I, Dh), *Mahāmātā Nagalakā* (S.R.E. I, J), on whose joint responsibility rested the efficient administration of such cities as *Tosali* and *Samāpā*. By implication the whole administration of each town or township was placed in charge of a similar body of officials. Undoubtedly *Aśoka's Mahāmāta Nagalaka* is the same official designation as *Kauṭilya's Nāgarika*.

In P.E. I, we have mention of *Antamahāmātā*, or *Mahāmātras* as Wardens of the Marches, an official designation corresponding to *Kauṭilya's Antapāla*. And it may be deduced from R.E. XIII that there were *Aṭavi-mahāmātā*, or *Mahāmātras* as Wardens of the Wild Tribes, a designation tallying with *Kauṭilya's Aṭavīpālas*. In each case, we are to assume that the responsibility imposed was the joint responsibility of a body of the same class of high officials.

The inscriptions of *Aśoka* contain clear hints to the effect that the administration of districts and fortified areas, too, was entrusted to different bodies of *Mahāmātras*, such hints as suggested by the plural expressions, *savata Mahāmātā*, "everywhere the *Mahāmātras*" (Queen's Edict), *āvate tūphākam āhāle*, *yāvataka tūpaka āhāle*, "as far as your (plural) jurisdiction" (Schism Pillar Edict, *Sārnāth*; M.R.E., *Rūpnāth*). The *Kausāmbī* copy of the Schism Pillar Edict is addressed, no doubt, to a single *Mahāmātra*, the *Mahāmātra* in the singular (*Devānāmpīye ānapayati Kosāmbiyam Mahāmāta*).

The *Dharmamahāmātras* (ante, p. 254): R.E. XII goes to show that in respect of their duty to encourage tolerance and promote growth in essence of the thing among the different sects of Indo-Aryan religion they were allied with the *Ithījhakha-mahāmātā*, *Vachabhūmikā*, and other bodies of the officials



(*añe nikāyā*). Similarly in respect of their duty to look after the welfare of the different religious sects or denominations they had something in common with the *Mahāmātras* who were specifically attached to this or that particular sect :

*paṭivisīṭhaṃ paṭivisīṭhaṃ tesu tesu te [te maha]mātā, dhammamahāmātā  
chu me etesu cheva viyāpaṭā savesu cha añnesu pāsāṃdesu* (P.E. VII).

It is presumably with reference to the Sectarian *Mahāmātras* that Aśoka enjoined in the Schism Pillar Edict (Sārnāth): *anuposathaṃ dhuvāye ikike mahāmāte posathāye yāti*, "invariably on the eighth day of the lunar fortnight (or, on every uposatha-day) a *Mahāmātra* by turn goes to attend the fast-day service." The *Sāmaññaphala Sutta*, the *Milindapañha* and the *Mahābodhi Jātaka* go to prove that among the courtiers of Indian kings, some were lay worshippers of one teacher and some of another, some were supporters of one school of religious thought, some of another. According to the Pali legend, however, Aśoka deputed an officer (*amachcha*) to the Aśokārāma for the suppression of dissension and the enforcement of the king's order among the resident Buddhist Brotherhood, who was a person without the least reverence for the Holy Order (*Mahāvamsa*, V. 236-40). But Aśoka's phrase *posathāye yāti*, "goes to attend the fast-day service," hardly leaves room for doubt that the attending *Mahāmātra* was to be counted among the Buddhist laity.

The *Ithījhakha-mahāmātras* correspond, according to Hultzsch, to Kauṭilya's *Gaṇikādhyaksha* or Superintendent of Courtezans. Raychaudhuri (*op. cit.*, p. 262) identifies them with the *Stryadhyakshas* (Guards of the Ladies or Superintendents of Women) of the *Mahābhārata*, otherwise called *Dārādhyakshas*.

Raychaudhuri compares them also with the *Antarvamsika* of the *Arthaśāstra*. They may certainly be identified with the Pali *Antepura-upachārakā Mahāmattā* or *Orodha-mahāmattā*, the *Mahāmātras* in charge of the royal households, especially the ladies. The female members of the royal *orodha* included the singing women (*nāṭakīṭṭhiyo*). Taking the word *ithī* or *strī* in its general sense to mean all women, one may suggest that among Aśoka's *Stryadhyakshas* were some who functioned as Kauṭilya's Superintendents of Courtezans. The designation *Adhyaksha* distinguishing this class of *Mahāmātras* may be cited to prove that the various *Adhyakshas* of Kauṭilya belonged to this class of high officials. How the *Stryadhyaksha Mahāmātras* might be instrumental in encouraging tolerance among the different sects and in helping them to grow in the essence of the thing (*sāravādhi*) is discussed under R.E. XII (*passim*).

From the context of R.E. XII, it is clear that the *Vrachabhūmikas*, too, were a class of *Mahāmātras* whose function, like that of the *Dharmamahāmātras* and *Stryadhyakshas*, was to encourage tolerance and promote the growth of different sects in essential things. The *Vrachabhūmikas* were concerned with *vrachabhūmi*, which is a word like the Pali *uyyāna-bhūmi*, 'park-site', *yānassa*



*bhūmi*, the reach, of a vehicle inside an enclosure, etc. The Sanskrit equivalent of *vrachabhūmi* is either *vrajabhūmi* or *varchabhūmi*, presumably the former. Hultsch identifies the *Vrachabhūmikas* with Kauṭilya's *Go-adhyaksha* and Vātsyāyana's *Gāvādhyaksha*, "the inspector of cow-pens," which does not fit in with the context. Some identify them with Kauṭilya's *Vivītādhyaksha* or Superintendent of Pastures, taking *vrachabhūmi* to mean the grazing ground of cattle. One need not introduce the idea of a cow-pen or stable, since by Kauṭilya's definition (*Arthasāstra*, II. 6) "cows, buffaloes, goats, sheep, asses, camels, horses and mules come under the head of herds (*'vraja'*)." Bhandarkar (*Aśoka*, p. 62) understands by Aśoka's *vrachabhūmi* "the grounds round about towns and villages" on which settled 'different castes which reared different flocks of cattle', and by *Vrachabhūmikas* the "officers concerned with *vrajas* spread all over the country." But he does not justify their mention in the context of R.E. XII. Mookerji (*Asoka*, p. 160) takes *Vrachabhūmi* in the sense of "roads" and suggests that the *Vrachabhūmikas* were "the officers in charge of the high roads along which travelled the people and pilgrims". He opines that "there were needed special officers to be in charge of roads and rest-houses, which Asoka was so liberal in providing.

Equating *vrachabhūmi* with *varchabhūmi*, interpreted in the sense of opera houses, places of musical entertainment, one may suggest that Aśoka's *Vrachabhūmikas* corresponded, partly at least, to Kauṭilya's *Gaṇikādhyaksha* who was placed also in charge of dramatic performances, professional musicians and musical parties. Unfortunately neither the word *Vrajabhūmi* nor the word *Varchabhūmi* is met with in literature, and until this is forthcoming one may treat *Vrachabhūmika* as a general official designation of all officers in charge of public roads, places and resorts and in respect of the royal palace, of the officers in charge of the open ground within the palace compound, especially of the promenade from which the king and other royal personages mounted the vehicles and conveyances. How these officers were useful to the different religious sects in respect of tolerance and the growth in the essence of things is discussed under R.E. XII (*passim*).

With reference to the *Mahāmātras* and the *Parishad* mentioned in R.E. V, Bhandarkar observes (*Aśoka*, p. 67) : "When he (Aśoka) issues an oral order or when a pressing matter devolves upon a *Mahāmātra*, the *Parishad* has to meet and discuss it. If they come to a unanimous decision, no question can arise as to its being carried out, but if there is a divergence of opinion or even unanimous opposition, it is for the king to see what this difference or opposition is and find out which of their counsels is most likely to be efficacious. But he must have the benefit of the views of the *Parishad* before he can take action, and in order that no delay may occur in the matter of taking his action, he commands the *Prativedakas* to report to him as soon as the views of the council are formed, whatever the time when and whatever the place where he may be."



8. *parisāyam* : "in the *Parishad*", "in the Council of Ministers", "in the Council of State", *Asoka's Parisā* being, according to Jayaswal nothing but the *Mantri-parishad* of the *Arthasāstra*. The Pali *Nikāyas* often speak of the eight *Parisas*, viz., *khattiya-parisā*, *brāhmaṇa-parisā*, etc. Buddhaghosa defines *Parisā* as 'a sitting of the representative men of a particular class of people.' Accordingly *khattiya-parisā ti khattiyānaṃ sannipativā nisinnatthānaṃ, na [tesaṃ] sabbe pi ch' etā parisā, uggatthāna-dassana-vasena gahītā*, "a *Kshatriya-parishad* is a sitting or meeting of the Nobles in their representative character", i.e., of those who may appear as representatives of their class in public estimation, a sectional representative body. The same as to other *Parisas* (*esa nayo sabbattha*, *Papañcha-sūdanī*, Siamese Ed., II, *Mahāsihanāda Sutta*). Similarly the *Lichchhavi-parisā* means a meeting or formal sitting of the representative men among the *Lichchhavis*. The same as to the *Pañchālānām Parishad* in the *Bṛihad-āraṇyaka Upanishad*, VI. 2.1, or the *Pañchālānām samiti* in the *Chhāndogya Upanishad*, V. 3.1.

Going by Buddhaghosa's definition of *Parisā*, *Asoka's Parisā* or *Kauṭilya's Mantri-parishad* may be treated as a representative body of all officials of the state under a monarchical constitution. Its members, whether known by the name of *Mahāmātras*, *Amātyas* or *Sachivas*, were the *rājakṛits*, Pali *rājakattāro*, or king-makers backed by the collective popular will which was always behind them. "The *Rāmāyaṇa* (II. 79. 1) in describing the ministers who put their resolution before Bharata, calls them king-makers (*sametya rājakarttāro Bharataṃ vākyam abruvan*)." The origin of the *Mantri-parishad* may indeed be traced in the working committee of the *Samiti*, the main business of which consisted in electing and re-electing a king (Jayaswal, *Hindu Polity*, I, p. 11). The security of the position of a monarch depended on the strength of the collective popular will in his favour (*Vessantara Jātaka*, No. 547). Just as Vedic literature distinguishes between the *Samiti* and the *Sabhā* and the Pali Canon between the *Parisā* and the *Sabhā*, so the Pali Chronicle *Dīpavaṃsa* (IV–V) draws a distinction between a *Sannipāta* (general conference or mass meeting of all persons concerned without distinction) and a *Sanḡitī* (Council of selected men). The account of the Second Buddhist Council goes to show that in order to facilitate the business of the *Sannipāta*, a Judicial Committee of eight representative men was appointed and its findings were held binding upon the conference as a whole. In the opinion of Jayaswal, "The Hindu Council of Ministers was a body and an organism which had differentiated and branched off from the old National Assembly of Vedic times, . . . . thus differentiated from the *Samiti-Parishad*, inherited the same name like the *Parishad* of Law. With that name they likewise inherited and retained the popular tradition and sense of responsibility" (*Hindu Polity*, II, p. 115 f.). And further, "The *rājakṛits* or king-makers appear later as *Ratnin* High Functionaries (Commander-in-chief, Treasurer, etc.) whom the king-elect worships before his



consecration. In worshipping the *Ratnins*, he does honour to them both as officers of the state and as representatives of the society."

According to the Divyāvadāna legend, Aśoka was able to seize the vacant throne of his father with the help of his father's minister, Rādhagupta, and virtually abdicated the throne when his ministers headed by Rādhagupta and supported by the citizens stood up against him.

The edicts of Aśoka, however, keep us in the dark as to the number and portfolios of the ministers who constituted the Council. Their number as well as portfolios varied from time to time and according to authorities (Hindu Polity, VI, p. 122 f.). By their common official designation Aśoka's ministers appear to have been known as *Mahāmātras*. The preambles of S.R.E. II (Dh) and M.R.E. (Si, Bra, Ja) attest that the *Mahāmātras* were the ministers who served as colleagues of his viceroys. His viceroys were, as a matter of fact, the Governors-in-Council. The administration of Samāpā was placed in charge of a Board of Commissioners who, too, bore the designation of *Mahāmātra*, and the same as to the administration of Isila. The *Mahāmātras* as ministers were *mantino Mahāmattā* (= *mantasampannā mahāmachchā*, Comy.) in the language of the Kosala-saṃyutta, III. 5.

It goes without saying that the ministers acting either individually or as members of the Council served as a check to the arbitrary powers of the king. But what precisely was the position of the *Mahāmātras* in their collective capacity as members of the *Parisā* under Aśoka's regime is still the point at issue.

Jayaswal has written a masterly dissertation on this point alone and sought to prove that while 'ordinary business went through only ministerial offices', 'extraordinary business was decided . . . . . in a full meeting of the Council'. He cites the authority of the Śukranītisāra which in its extant form is a very late work on Hindu Polity to establish :

"Without a written document no business of state was done. A matter was endorsed first by the Home Minister, the Lord Chief Justice, the Minister of Law, and the Minister of Diplomacy with the fixed style '*This is not opposed to us*', i.e., their departments had no objection. The Minister of Revenue and Agriculture endorsed with the remark '*The note is all right*,' the Minister of Finance '*Well considered*'; then the President of the Council inscribed in his own hand '*Really proper*'. Next, the Pratinidhi wrote '*Fit to be accepted*', the Yuvarāja following, with '*Should be accepted*' in his own hand. The Ecclesiastical Minister (Purohita) endorsed '*This is agreeable to me*.' Every minister affixed his seal at the end of his note. Finally the King wrote '*Accepted*' and set his seal. He was supposed to be unable to go through the document carefully and the Yuvarāja or some one else was to make this endorsement for him which was shown to him. After this first stage was over, the minute was signed by all the ministers as the Council (*gaṇa*) and sealed with



the seal of the council. Finally it was once more presented to the king who without delay wrote 'Seen' as he had not the capacity to criticise it."

Referring to the charters of grant made by kings in the Gupta period, he observes: "The copper-plate grant made by king Hastin in the year corresponding to 510 A.C. is first sanctioned by *Mahāsāndhi-vigrāhika* Vidhudatta and finally passed by the senior minister of army, *Mahābalādhikṛit*, Nāgasimha, who signs as the *Dūtaka*. Another grant made by a contemporary of Hastin is signed by a man who has no official title; it is not countersigned by any minister and it is recorded to have been made on the oral order of the ruler. The charter has no *dūtaka* either. It is evident that the grant did not pass through the Council as there was no written order of the ruler. It might have been made from the private lands of the donor." (Hindu Polity, II, p. 150 f.)

The two pieces of evidence cited by Jayaswal are beside the point, so far as Aśoka's statement in R.E. VI is concerned. In this edict Aśoka is eager to be informed immediately (by the reporters, *paṭivedakā*) of the final result of the debate or deliberation in the Council of Ministers in respect of the oral orders issued by him concerning gifts or proclamations as well as certain urgent matters entrusted by him (apparently verbally) to his *Mahāmātras*. Here the written orders are altogether out of the question.

As regards certain written dispatches from the viceregal headquarters at Tosali and Suvarṇagiri, Aśoka's definite instruction was to address them with due official courtesy to the *Mahāmātras* at Samāpā and Isila (Rishila) on the joint authority of the Viceroy and the *Mahāmātras-Mantrimahāmātras* concerned. The message to be communicated was the message of the king supplied from the capital.

It may be pertinently asked: Does Aśoka's statement in R.E. VI presuppose the constitutional power of the Council of Ministers to reject the king's oral orders concerning gifts and announcements and entrusting of urgent matters (*āchāyike āropitaṃ*) to the *Mahāmātras*? According to Jayaswal, it does; I say, it does not. All depends on a correct interpretation of the phrase *vivādo nijhatī va*. As regards the interpretation of the first word *vivāda*, there is hardly any difference of opinion. To Jayaswal the second word *nijhati* means 'total rejection', and to me, 'an agreement as a result of sound deliberations'. The word *nijhati*, Pali *nijjhatti*, as shown, does not mean 'rejection', not to speak of 'total rejection'. The oral orders had already been issued and the urgent matters entrusted on the king's own initiative and authority before these came up for discussion and opinion before the Council. The king was evidently absent when his ministers met in the Council. There is not the slightest indication in any of the remaining records of Aśoka that he either acted *ultra vires* or had to encounter opposition from the Council. The first point of discussion, no doubt, is the validity of Aśoka's constitutional right to issue oral orders, or for the matter of that, orders in any form, concerning gifts and proclamations affecting the royal treasury or state funds as well as the state policy. According



to all authorities on Hindu polity, the ministers were required to be very careful about the royal treasury, since the efficiency of administration largely depended on the strength of the treasury. The king and other members of the royal family were at liberty to make gifts or do humanitarian works out of their private purse or funds. The gifts to be made out of the state funds formed the bone of contention. And on this particular point Jayaswal cites the following authorities and evidences to prove his case :

(1) The opinion of Āpastamba, II. 10. 26. 1, that it was not competent for the king to make gifts even to Brahmins if the ministers opposed the gifts (*bhṛityānām anuparodhena kshetram vittān cha dadad brāhmaṇebhyaḥ yathārham anantān-llokān abhijayati, here bhṛityā* representing, according to the Arthaśāstra, *mantri-purohitādi bhṛityavargam*).

(2) The evidence of the Divyāvadāna legend of Aśoka stating that the Ministry including the Yuvarāja under Chancellor Rādhagupta refused to make further gifts to the Buddhist Brotherhood on the order of the Emperor and that the emperor was deprived of his royal authority in order to prevent further extravagance of charity on the ground—"Kings' strength lies in treasury" (*kośa-balinaścha rājāno*).

(3) The evidence of the Junāgaṛh Rock Inscription of Rudradāman I showing that when the opinion of his ministers was against his proposal for repairing the Sudarśana Lake, and they refused to pay for the repairs, he had to pay from his private purse.

(4) The evidence of the various copper-plate grants of the Gupta period showing that the *Mahāsāndhivigrāhika* acting on behalf of the Ministry was the official competent to sanction the charter of grant, while it was finally passed by the minister or official who signed as *Dūtaka*.

(5) The procedure to be followed, according to the Śukranītisāra, in issuing a written official order or document which reached its final form as soon as it was signed by all the ministers of the Council and sealed with the seal of the Council, the king being denied the right of criticizing it thereafter.

It will be seen that Āpastamba's opinion has been interpreted too rigidly. All that Āpastamba means to say is that a king can derive the highest benefit from a gift of land and money made to the Brāhmins as he deems proper, if it is unopposed by his servants, the body of high officials. From this it does not follow that the king was not competent to make the gift even in disregard of the opinion of his officials.

Secondly, the Divyāvadāna account of the sad end of Aśoka's career resulting from the impoverishment of the state due to his extravagant liberality to the Buddhist Brotherhood is obviously too fantastic and too much coloured by later ideas of constitutional laws to deserve credence. At all events, it re-



mains up till now uncorroborated by Aśoka's inscriptions which tell altogether a different tale. In them, e.g., R.E. XII, he expressly says that he honoured all sects, all denominations, of recluses and householders with gifts and by various modes of honouring (*pūjayati dānena cha vividhāya cha pūjāya*).

Thirdly, the Divyāvadāna and the inscriptions bear out the fact that Aśoka had followed a quinquennial system in carrying out works of public utility, evidently to prevent a heavy drain on state resources.

Fourthly, it is clear from the language of R.E. VI that the Council of Ministers had a say in the matter, but there is nothing to show that Aśoka feared any irresistible opposition from the Council.

And fifthly, we have seen (*ante*, p. 248) that Aśoka authorised his *Puruṣas* or Secretaries, and not the *Parisā* or Council of Ministers, to instruct the subordinate officers in the Imperial Secretariat in the matter of formulating or codifying his messages and orders.

The second point of discussion is the constitutional validity of the entrusting of urgent matters to the *Mahāmātras* by Aśoka on his own initiative.

Aśoka's statement in R.E. VI unmistakably shows that the Council of Ministers had a say in the matter, but there is nothing to suggest that the opinion of the Council, even if it went against his action, invalidated his orders. At the most he invited and welcomed an honest and healthy criticism from the Council. The ministers were left to themselves to carry on their discussions and deliberations uninterfered by the king who was not present in the Council. The only outsider present when the Council was in session was the reporter or body of reporters who watched the proceedings to faithfully report to the king as quickly as possible.

In this connexion Jayaswal cites the authority of Kauṭilya to prove that the decision of the majority of the ministers consulted together was binding on the king. I say, it is doubtful. Kauṭilya in his chapter on 'The business of Council Meeting, opines: "All kinds of administrative measures are preceded by deliberations in a well-formed Council. The subject matter of a Council shall be entirely secret, and deliberations in it shall be so carried (on) that birds cannot see them." He discusses the views of previous thinkers before he expresses his own opinion. In the opinion of Bhāradvāja, the king alone should deliberate over secret matters, no outside person should know anything of the work the king has in view, and only those who are to carry it out should know it either when it is begun or when accomplished. Viśālākṣha differing, says: He should sit at deliberation with persons of wide intellect, he must despise none, but hear the opinion of all. -According to Parāśara, he should just indirectly ascertain the opinions of his ministers without actually letting them know the thing he has in view. Piśuna suggests that instead of consulting all, he should consult only such persons as are believed to be capable of giving a decisive opinion in the particular matter. Kauṭilya would recommend consultation with at least three or four ministers. "When there is an extraordinary



matter the *Mantrins* and the *Mantri-parishad* should be called together and informed. In the meeting whatever the majority decide to be done, should be done by the king (*ātyayike kārye mantrino mantri-parishadañchāhūya brūyāt, tatra yad bhūyishṭhāḥ kāryasiddhikaram vā brūyus tat kuryāt*). As Jayaswal points out, this is, to all intents and purposes, the same as the opinion of Manu (VII. 57) according to which "the king should consult the ministers separately and then all of them together,—i.e., as Medhātithi explains, in the Council.

But where is the binding character of the decision or opinion of the Council of Ministers? In Aśoka's case, the urgent matters were already entrusted to the *Mahāmātras* concerned independently of the Council. Evidently the king did not summon the Council. The ministers met to discuss relevant matters in the absence of the king. If Aśoka expressed eagerness to know the final result of the Council's deliberations and the upshot of the Council's criticism, it was certainly not out of anger or fear. It would rather seem that Aśoka was just making an experiment, maybe a dangerous experiment, to see whether his ministers left to themselves and free to discuss matters could evolve a policy or suggest a measure beneficial to the state and the people. Viewed in the light of the views cited from the *Arthasāstra*, the earlier government was entirely based upon distrust and hypocrisy and it was to the interest of Aśoka as an administrative reformer to see how far it could be based upon trust and sincerity.

The position of the *Parishad* is correctly stated by Bhandarkar (Aśoka, p. 67) in whose opinion "the *Parishad* was like a modern Executive Council which was an intermediate body between the king and the *Mahāmātras*, and it appears that whereas, on the one hand, it saw that the written orders of the king were carried out by the different officials, it had, on the other, the power to scrutinise his oral orders before they were executed and to suggest what course of action could meet what pressing contingencies of the *Mahāmātras* for the information and approval of the king, who was, of course, the final arbiter."

9. *uṣṭānam cha athasaṁtīranā cha* : These are the two points stressed in the edict in question. The first is *uṣṭāna*, *uṭhāna*, Pali *uṭṭhāna*, Sk. *utthāna*. This represents the principle of action and the second *athasaṁtīranā*, Pali *atthakaraṇā* (Kosala-Saṁyutta, I. 7), its application. In Aśoka's phraseology, *uṣṭāna* has for its synonyms *pakama* (M.R.E.), *parākrama* (implied in R.E.X). In Pali, the synonyms of *uṭṭhāna* are *appamāda*, *daḍḍha-parakkama*, *attakāra*, *purisakāra*, *bala*, *virīya*, *sātachcha*, and the like. In *apramāda* lay the active phase of *śraddhā* or faith of the heroic age. In the *Arthasāstra*, the *Jātakas* and the *Mahābhārata* *utthāna* is extolled as the root principle of administration (*ante*, p. 39). With the Buddha *appamāda* was the single word by which the whole of his teaching might be summed up. In the Kosala-Saṁyutta, II. 8, king Pasenadi is advised by the Buddha to base his daily life on this single principle



(*eko dhammō appamādo*), as thereby he might keep him active, wakeful and guarded along with his family members and vassal kings, and guard and protect his treasury and storehouses (*kosa-koṭṭhāgāraṃ*). According to the Pali legend, it was the teaching of the Appamāda-vagga from the Dhammapada that made the first and abiding appeal to Aśoka. The Sanatsujātīya-gītā in the Mahābhārata is wholly devoted to a systematic exposition of a single śloka corresponding to the first verse of the Appamāda-vagga which declares : *appamādo amata-padam, pamādo machchuno padam*, 'watchfulness is the step to immortality, inertness the step to death'. Cp. Mahābhārata, and Besnagar Garuḍa Pillar Inscription of Heliodoros.

The Upanishad boldly proclaims : *nāyam ātmā balahīnena labhyaḥ*, and exhorts : *Uttishṭhata jāgrata prāpya varān nibodhata*. "Arise, awake, comprehend the supreme object which is attainable".

In the same strain the Pali Utthāna Sutta in the Sutta-nipāta urges men into action, saying : *Uttahatha nisīdatha ko attho supitena vo?* "Rise up, sit erect, what's the use sleeping?" Thus *utthāna*, which is a metaphorical expression, primarily means rising up from sleep, slumber, drowsiness, stupor, inertia. Cp. the Pali exhortation : *uttitṭhe na pamajjeyya*, "must arise (and) not be inert." The five points stressed in the valedictory address of the Taittirīya Upanishad, I. 1.1, read : *Satyān na pramāditavyam. Dharmān na pramāditavyam. Kuśalān na pramāditavyam. Bhūtyai na pramāditavyam. Svādhyāya-pravachanābhyām na pramāditavyam*.

Figuratively only *utthāna* means the active state of mind and body. The opposite state of *usthāna*, according to S. R. E. I, is represented by *anāvutī* (non-application), *ālasiya* (indolence), and *kilamatha* (fatigue). In the same edict Aśoka lays down this maxim of conduct : "Those who are weary of exertion, they after getting up, are not fit to move about, or for the matter of that, to walk or proceed" (*e kilamte siyā na te ugacha saṃchalitaviye tu vaṭitaviye etāviye vā*).

Aśoka's principle of *utthāna* or *parākrama* seeks its fulfilment through *atthasantirāṇa*, 'prompt dispatch of state business', and is directed to doing good to the whole world (*sarvalokahita*), to making all beings happy here and enabling all men to attain heaven hereafter, particularly to promote other-worldly interests (*savarn pāratrikāya*, R.E.X). It required all including him and his officers to apply themselves ceaselessly and eternally (*sasvatam samayam*, S.R. E.I) to the noble cause espoused by way of faithfully and effectively discharging the duties assigned (*bhūtānam ānamnam gachheyaṃ*, R.E. VI). In short, action, and action alone, was the underlying principle of Aśoka's *Dhamma* and system of administration.

10. *idha cha nāni sukhāpayāmi paratrā cha svagam ārādhayaṃtu* : This is quite in consonance with the Epic dictum—*ārādhayet svagam imam cha lokam* (ante,



p. 41) and the Buddha's pronouncement on *appamāda* in the Kosala-Saṃyutta, II. 7. : *appamādo kho eko dhammo ubho atthe samadhiggayha tiṭṭhati diṭṭha-dhammikaṃ ch'eva atthaṃ samparāyikaṃ cha.*

As regards the clause, *nāni sukhāpayāmi idha*, attention may be drawn to the Buddha's statement in the Kosala-Saṃyutta, II. 9 : *Sappariso kho uḷāre bhoge labhivā attānaṃ sukheti piṇeti, mātāpitaro sukheti piṇeti, puttadāraṃ sukheti piṇeti, dāsakammakaraporise sukheti piṇeti, mittāmachche sukheti piṇeti, samaṇesu brāhmaṇesu uddhaggikaṃ dakkhiṇaṃ patitṭhāpeti sovaggikaṃ sukhavipākaṃ saggasaṃvattanikaṃ.* "A good man acquiring a large fortune, pleases and strengthens himself, pleases and strengthens his parents, wife and children, friends and associates, and sets up gifts to the *Śramaṇas* and the *Brāhmaṇas* that lead to higher and higher states of existence, have a happy result and conduce to the attainment of heaven."

Aśoka in his P. E. VII, enumerates the various works of public utility whereby he himself and his predecessors tried to please the world (*pulimehi pi lājhi mamayā cha sukhayite loke*).

As to R. E. VII :—

1. *rājā sarvata ichhati save pāsaṃḍā vaseyu* : This is translated by "The king wishes that all sects should dwell everywhere." In commenting on this, Mookerji (Aśoka, p. 149) observes : "This is apparently against Kauṭilya's injunction that '*pāsaṃḍas* and *chaṇḍālas* are to dwell near the cremation ground (beyond the city) [II. 4]. Elsewhere [II. 36] Kauṭilya also rules that no *pāsaṃḍas* could be accommodated in a *dharmaśālā* without the permission of the city officer, *Gopa*, and their abode should be searched for suspicious characters." But in the context of the edict Aśoka is not concerned with the question of accommodation in a *dharmaśālā* of the *pāsaṃḍas* in the sense of all sects. By the expression *sarvata*, 'everywhere', he means *sarvata vijite*, 'everywhere in his dominions'. So with reference to these sects he says in R.E. XIII : *ye tatra vasati* (Sh), *e tata tatā vasati*, 'those who dwell here and there'; and again, *nasti se janapade yatra ime nikāya añatra Yoneshu*, 'there is no locality except that of the Yaunas where these bodies [of the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Sramaṇas*] are not'. Kauṭilya's injunction against the *pāsaṃḍas* in the sense of 'heretics' was evidently meant to guard against the action of the spies of the enemy kings in an ascetic garb (cf. Kosala-saṃyutta, II. 1).



2. *yasa nāsti sayame, bhāvasudhitā kataññatā daḍhabhatitā*: Here is a category of four moral qualities, which is reduced to that of two in the statement *save te sayamañ cha bhāvasudhiñ cha ichhati*, "he wishes them all *sañyama* and *bhāvasuddhi*". Corresponding to Aśoka's category of four, we have in the Mahābhārata, Śāntiparva, one of *drīḍhabhaktitva*, *kṛitajñatā*, *dharmaññatā* and *indriya-sañyama*; one of *kṛitajñatā*, *drīḍhabhaktitva*, *sañvibhājanā* and *jīten-driyatā*; and a third of *kṛitajñatā*, *prājñatā akshudratā*, *drīḍhabhaktitva* and *jīten-driyatā* (ante, p. 45). Considered in the light of the Epic parallels, *sayama* or *sañyama* is the moral quality of one whose senses are controlled or well-controlled; *sañyatassa bhāvo sañyamo*, according to the Pali scholiast Buddhaghosa. It is self-control practised with regard to action, speech and thought and all the organs of sense :

*Chakkhunā saṁvaro sādhu, sādhu sotena saṁvaro |*  
*ghāṇena saṁvaro sādhu, sādhu jivhāya saṁvaro ||*  
*Kāyena saṁvaro sādhu, sādhu vācchāya saṁvaro |*  
*manasā saṁvaro sādhu, sādhu sabbattha saṁvaro ||*  
*Hatthasaññato pādasaññato, vācchāya saññato saññatuttamo |*  
*ajjhattarato samāhito, eko sañtusito tam āhu bhikkhuñ ||*  
*Yo mukhasaññato bhikkhu mantabhāñi anuddhato |*  
*atthañ dhammañ cha dīpeti madhurañ tassa bhāsitañ ||*

In R. E. XII, Aśoka lays much stress on self-control by way of *vachiguti*, 'restraint of speech', *sayamo sadhu* (Sh), that kind of self-restraint which enables the adherents of different sects to learn one another's doctrine. In R. E. IX, on the other hand, he praises the practice of self-control with regard to living beings and things, i.e., of the tender regard for life (*pāñesu sayamo sādhu*, which is really a question from a then known Buddhist text).

*Kataññatā* is the moral quality of the *kṛitajña* or *kṛitaprajña*, 'one who is grateful'. The opposite quality is *akataññatā* or 'ingratitude', 'ungratefulness', which expresses itself in these three forms : (1) non-acknowledgement of the service received, (2) non-return of the service received, and (3) harming the benefactor, as implied in the following verse of the Jāvasakuṇa Jātaka :

*Akataññuñ akattārañ katassa appatikāraṇañ |*  
*yassa kataññutā n'atthi nīratthā tassa sevanā ||*

Accordingly gratitude consists in (1) acknowledgement of the service received, (2) return of the service received, and (3) not harming the benefactor.

*Daḍhabhatitā* or *drīḍhabhaktitva* is the moral quality of the *drīḍhabhakta*, 'one with firm devotion.' In the present context, Aśoka speaks of the four qualities that enhance the value of gifts or acts of charity and liberality. A gift



to be of an intrinsic value must be one offered in a gentle form, with a feeling of gratitude and out of strong faith, what in Pali is called *saddhādeyyam dānam* (Dīgha—N. I, p. 6 f.).

The quality which remains to be explained is *bhāvasudhitā*. It is the moral quality of the *bhāvasuddha*, 'one whose heart is pure'. The Sanskrit equivalent is missed in all the three parallels cited from the Great Epic. But its meaning may be comprehended from *prājñatā*, 'wisdom', *dharmajñatā*, 'knowledge of the Law of Duty', *akshudratā*, 'magnanimity', and *saṁvibhājanā*, 'charitable disposition.' In P. E. IV, Aśoka himself expressed his delight in promoting among the people various practices of piety, self-control and distribution of charity (*vividhe dhammachalane saṁyame dāna-savibhāge*). Charity to be worth the name must be an outcome of a charitable heart,—of a pure heart or sentiment which is shaped by the knowledge of the vicissitudes of life, the comprehension of its true utility. The meaning of *bhāvasudhitā* is fully suggested by Kauṭilya's *maitratā* or 'friendliness.'

#### As to R. E. VIII :—

✓ 1. *vihārayātā, viharayātrā* : 'pleasure trips', 'merry excursions'. 'Aśoka himself defines *viharayātrā* as *magavyā añāni cha etārisāni abhīramakāni*, 'hunting, and such other diversions', 'pastimes typified by hunting.' The rest of the diversions are not enumerated. The same is to be deduced from Kauṭilya's prescription (Arthaśāstra, II. 2) : *mṛigavānām viharārtham rājñah kārayet*. Aśoka's statement suggests that hunting was the most favourite diversion with the former kings of India, and this is amply corroborated by the Jātakas, the Epics and the Arthaśāstra. The Mahābhārata, Vanaparva, 238-6, declares : *mṛigayā učitā, mṛigayā śobhanā*, 'going a hunting is proper, fitting'. Even Aśoka's only younger uterine brother, crown-prince Tishya, is said to have gone on a hunting expedition (Mahāvamsa, V. 154 : *migavam gato*). The *mṛigayā* consisted chiefly in the hunting of deer or different species of antelopes. The Jātakas and the Epics and other Indian works hardly speak of hunting other species of quadrupeds. Kauṭilya (Arthaśāstra, II. 2), however, recommends the maintenance of a special enclosed game forest with tigers and other beasts of prey, elephants and bisons, all deprived of their claws and teeth, for the king's sports, and the provision of a separate game forest with game beasts, open to all, in a suitable locality. P.E.V expressly refers to the elephant forests as hunting ground for all. The antelopes and other eatable quadrupeds that were daily killed in



Asoka's kitchen must have been domesticated beasts. In accounting for the purpose of the daily slaughter of many hundred thousands of lives in Asoka's kitchen in the past, prior to the promulgation of R. E. I, Bhandrakar (Asoka, p. 21 f. ; I.A., 1913, p. 255 f.) draws our attention to the Mahābhārata, Vanaparva, 207. 8-10, in which we are told that in a former age, the queen of Rantideva caused to be daily killed in the royal kitchen two thousand cattle (lit. beasts), and king Rantideva acquired an unrivalled fame for having offered food with meat by daily killing two thousand cows, and that invariably during the period of *chāturmāsya* :

*Rājñi mahānase pūrvam Rantidevasya vai dvija |  
dve sahasre tu vadhyete paśūnām anvaham tadā ||  
Ahanyahani vadhyete dve sahasre gavām tathā |  
samāmsam dadato hyannam Rantidevasya nityaśah ||  
Atulā kīrttir abhavan, nṛipasya dvijasattamah |  
chāturmāsye cha paśavo vadhyanta iti nityaśah ||*

Here, too, the creatures killed were evidently domesticated beasts.

Raychaudhuri(*op. cit.*, p. 267) cites a verse from the Mahābhārata, XV. 1, which characterises the *vihārayātrās* as *sarva-hāmapradā*, 'fulfilling all desires for enjoyment', without specifying them. And in the Arthasāstra, XIII. 2, the clause *yāḥ prekshā prekshate*, 'the dramatic performance which the king witnesses', precedes *yātrāvihāre ramate*, 'the merry excursion in which he takes delight'. The processional royal drive to the pleasure garden of which the heavenly prototype is the Nandana grove of Śakra cannot but be meant by the word *vihārayātrā*, the *vihāra* or sportful personal behaviour including what Kauṭilya calls *svaira-vihāra* or free dalliance with singing women or courtezans. The Achchharā poem in the Saṃyutta Nikāya, I, offers us a vivid description of the *vihārayātrā* :

*Achchharāgaṇa-saṃghuttam Pisāchagaṇa-sevitam  
vanantam mohanam nāma, katham yātrā bhavissati ?*

"The infatuating grove (of Nandana) is resounded (with the music of) the company of mirthful nymphs and served by lustful female companions ; how can there be an egress (*yātrā*) therefrom ?" Buddhaghosa in his Commentary on the Sāmaññaphala Sutta, gives a graphic description of a royal procession bound for a mango-grove. The Achchharā verses with a pun on the word *yātrā* mean to say that the royal *vihārayātrā* does not constitute the *yātrā* or way of escape from the bondage of passion and delusion. As the Ummadanti-Jātaka suggests, it was rather risky even for a handsome married lady to peep out through the window and attract the attention of a king when he was out on a pleasure-drive through the city.



2. *ayāya Sambodhiṃ* : The same as *nikhami Sambodhi*, 'started for Sam-

bodhi', 'undertook a pilgrimage to Sambodhi.' The word *Sambodhi* has both a physical and a spiritual meaning ; in its physical sense, it means the Bo-tree (cf. *Kāliṅgabodhi Jātaka* : *mahāyitvāna Sambodhiṃ*, 'having worshipped the Bo-tree, or the terrace or spot of the Bo-tree, *Bodhimandaṃ*) ; and in its spiritual sense, it means the enlightenment of a Perfect Buddha. The *Mahāvamsa* (XVIII. I, XIX. 7-8) and other works apply the name *Mahābodhi* to the same Bo-tree of Buddha Śākyamuni. Bhandarkar prefers the first meaning, (according to which, Aśoka's statement implies a physical process, namely, that of going a pilgrimage to the spot of the *Bodhivriksha* or *Bodhidruma* which is so sacred to the Buddhist world (see, Barua's *Gayā and Buddhagayā*, I, Sec. 5.). Aśoka places his visit to Bodhgayā in the 10th year of his *abhisheka*, and there is no record to show that he had then visited any other place sacred to Buddhism. The Pali legend assigns Aśoka's visit to Bodhgayā to his 18th regnal year (*Mahāvamsa*, XX.I). If the tradition be true, it must be his second visit. In his 20th regnal year, he had certainly visited the village of Lumbini which was known to him as the place of nativity of Buddha Śākyamuni and the enlarged Stūpa of Buddha Koṇāgamana. According to the *Divyāvadāna* legend, however, when Aśoka visited all the important places in Northern India, including Bodhgayā, associated with the life of the Buddha under the guidance of his religious preceptor Upagupta, it was a continuous tour. In this connexion Mookerji observes (*Aśoka*, p. 151 f.) : "The *Divyāvadāna*, however, makes Lumbini-vana as the first of the holy places visited by Aśoka on his pilgrimage with Upagupta, and his visit to Bodhi-mūla following afterwards. (The *Divyāvadāna* dates Aśoka's pilgrimage as following the construction of his *vihāras* and *stūpas* which, according to the *Mahāvamsa* (V. 173), were completed after the seventh year of his coronation.) ...and so the legends may be taken to be at one with the inscription on this point." As regards his finding, the discrepancy between the two legends is so flagrant, as also between them and the inscriptions, I do not think that it is convincing at all.

3. *tenesā dhammayātā, tena tā dhammayātā* : "Therefore these tours of morality were undertaken" (Hultzsch) ; "hence this touring for Dharma" (Bhandarkar) ; "whence these *Dharmayātrās*" (Mookerji). I prefer translating it : "Thereby it turned out to be a pilgrimage of piety". On this point Mookerji (*Aśoka*, p. 151) holds : "The going to Sambodhi or Gayā was the first of Aśoka's *Dharmayātrās*, which afterwards became the order of the day, as definitely stated in the Edict in the expression, *tenesā dharmayātā* (G)". He is evidently misled by the *Divyāvadāna* (p. 389 f.) in which we read :

*Atha rājā... "Ayaṃ me manoratho ye Bhagavatā Buddhena pradeśe"*



*adhyushitās tām arecheyām chihmāni cha kuryām paśchimasyām janatāyām anugrahārtham."*

"The king said [to Upagupta]: This is my resolution that I should personally worship the places graced with sojourn by Buddha the Blessed One and put up tangible signs for the benefit of later generations."

The implication of the king's utterance is that his intention was to mark out the holy spots of Buddhism with tangible structures to help posterity or future visitors and pilgrims to easily locate them. And undoubtedly Aśoka's example proved to be a great incentive to pilgrimages on the part of the later followers of the Buddha. But that is not precisely the meaning of Aśoka's dictum in the edict. What he means is that his visit to Sambodhi assumed the form of a piety-tour or piety-pilgrimage, which he himself has fully described in the text.

✓4. *dhammayātā* : Sk. *dharmayātrā*, "pilgrimage of piety." In the edict this is given precedence over *vihārayātrā* on the ground that greater delight may be derived from it (*tadopayā esā bhūya rati bhavati*). The delight arising from *dharmayātrā* is claimed to have been the king's own portion. The distinction between the two *yātrās*, *vihāra* and *dharma*, is very clear from the text itself. The question really is—what is the difference between the time-honoured *tīrthayātrā* and Aśoka's *dharmayātrā*? The *Nirvāṇayātrā* as contemplated in the Pali Achchharā verses in the Saṃyutta Nikāya, I, is too serious a thing to be within the scope of Aśoka's *dharmayātrā*. Even apart from the *Tīrthayātrā* section of the Vanaparva of the Mahābhārata, there are very old *gāthās* in the Pali Nikāyas, e.g., the Vatthūpama Sutta of the Majjhima Nikāya, I, in which we are given a list of certain sacred rivers, the waters whereof were popularly believed to have possessed purificatory property. So the people from different parts of India, ascetics and householders, flocked to those *tīrthas* for ablution. Those *tīrthas* were resorted to also for the performance of *tarpaṇa* in the interests of the manes or disembodied spirits. The Mahābhārata list includes a great many *tīrthas* in the shape of sacred lakes, tanks, wells, springs, trees, and hermitages of the accredited sages and saints of old. Bodhgayā which became one of the four most important places of Buddhist pilgrimage was in point of fact but the spot of a lordly *Āśvattha* tree associated with the living memory of Buddhahood attained by the ascetic Siddhārtha. The Buddha himself is said to have singled out the four places as those worth visting by the faithful laity for an inspiration and incentive to higher life (*dassanīyam samvejanīyam thānam*, Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta), namely, the place where the Budhisattva was born, i.e., the garden of Lumbinī; the place where he obtained perfect Buddhahood,



*i.e.*, Bodhgayā; the place where he addressed his first Discourse, *i.e.*, the Deer Park of Isipatana; and the place where his great Decease took place, *i.e.*, Kusinārā. Though these words of the Buddha served as the Canonical basis of the Buddhist idea of pilgrimage to all the important places associated with the life of the Buddha, his illustrious predecessors and great disciples, it was left to Aśoka to define the form and purpose of such pilgrimages. In his opinion, to be effective to a cultured man, it must consist in meeting the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Śramaṇas* of different orders and leaders of thought and showing liberality to them, in meeting elderly people and making money provisions for them, in coming into contact with the people of countrysides and outer towns, instructing them in the Law of Piety or Duty and discussing the subject with them. All these were implied in the popular *tīrthayātrā*. Aśoka's definition of *dharmayātrā* served only to bring them into bold relief by throwing the superstitious beliefs into the dark background. The genuine admiration for human attainments and the noble aspiration for a life of piety and morality came to be relied upon as the urge to pilgrimage. But superstition dies hard: it has held its ground as fast as before in spite of the rational aspect introduced into it.

5. *tadopayā*: "suitable for this occasion" (Hultzsch); "as suitable thereto" (Mookerji). Both are guided by Franke's equation of the word with *tadūpagā* or *tadupakā*. But in R.E. II the word *upaga* or *upaka* is retained intact, cp. *manusopagāni*, *manuśopakani*. I treat this word as the fifth case of *upaya*, which in Pali means 'an undertaking', 'a work'.

6. *bhāge amñe*: "an extraordinary luck (Bhandarkar); "an additional portion" (Mookerji). I prefer to construe it as *rāño bhāge amñe*, "the other, *i.e.*, the greater delight arising from the *dharmayātrā*, is the king's portion." Compare the Pali *aññabhāgiyaṃ* (Pātimokkha, Saṃghādisesa, 9).

As to R. E. IX:—

1. *uchāvacham maṃgalaṃ*: The same as to say *bahukam cha bahuvidham maṃgalaṃ*, "many and diverse rites". Hultzsch translates *maṃgala* by "ceremonies." The rites or ceremonies were those performed or observed at the time of illness, at the marriage of sons and daughters, at the time of the birth of sons (better, children), or for the advent of offspring, and in setting out on a journey to a distant place. Especially the womenfolk are said to have performed many and diverse rites that were minor and meaningless (*chudam cha nīratham cha*). Here Aśoka just shared men's opinion about women's rites and



ceremonies, which they tolerate with reluctance. As for major rites or ceremonies, they have received sanction from the Vedas and are systematically prescribed in the Gṛhya-sūtras and the Law-books. The *maṅgalas* presupposed by the Pali Maṅgala Sutta and the Mahāmaṅgala Jātaka (No. 453) are certain popular superstitions that had bearings on the daily life of men. The beliefs are classified under these three heads: (1) *diṭṭha* or those concerning some auspicious signs (*abhimāṅgalasammataṃ rūpaṃ*), e.g., an all-white bull, an (all-white) horse of noble breed, an (all-white) horse-drawn chariot, a woman with child, tawny cow; (2) *Suta* or those concerning auspicious sounds (*abhimāṅgalasammataṃ saddaṃ*), e.g., to hear someone saying, "fulfilled", "increased", "increasing", "lucky"; and (3) *mata* or those concerning torches, smells, etc., e.g., to tread on green grasses, cow-dung, to touch a redfish drawn fresh from water, to smell a lotus flower and other sweet scents. These popular beliefs, too strong and persistent through ages to resist, determined the course of men's action. Even in the case of the daily life of a king, Kauṭilya prescribes (Arthaśāstra, I. 19): "Having saluted both a cow with its calf and a bull by circumambulating them, he shall get into his court." In the Mahāmaṅgala Jātaka as well as the Maṅgala Sutta, the word *māṅgala* is used in the sense of *soṭṭhi*, *svasti* or 'well-being', 'welfare', and the way to it.

2. *dharmamaṅgala*: With the prevalent popular *maṅgala* Aśoka compares and contrasts what he calls *dharmamaṅgala*, Sk. *dharma-maṅgala*, meaning the well-being secured by means of piety. In the absence of literary usages, Aśoka must be credited with the coinage of the word which became so popular in Bengal as the name of a class of ancient Bengali literature dating as far back as the 17th. or 18th. century A.D., if not still earlier. He gives a clear definition of the term, which undoubtedly proves that all that he wanted to say was in substance the duties of a good householder stated in the Mahāmaṅgala Jātaka and the Mahāmaṅgala Suttanta (same as Maṅgala Sutta), and systematically in the Siṅgālovāda Sutta of the Dīgha Nikāya, III. And yet the Buddhist text, presupposed by the edict is not, as will be presently shown, not any or all of the three mentioned above; it is certainly the Sādhū Sutta in the Saṃyutta Nikāya, I, and nothing else. In Aśoka's opinion, the *maṅgalas* or auspicious rites are of little efficacy as compared with the *dharmamaṅgala* which is of great efficacy; even if the first-named rites be efficacious, they are effective only here, in the present world, while the latter produces an infinite merit hereafter, should it fail to produce any effect here.

3. *dāśabhatakamhi samyapratipati*: Lit., "seemly behaviour to slaves and servants". This is the first of the four main duties of a noble householder in which Aśoka's *dharmamaṅgala* consisted. The same is the case with R.E. XI. In R.E. XIII and P.E. VII, however, this item is put last. The Pali expression



*dāsakammakara-porisā* corresponds to Aśoka's *dāsabhatakā*. The Buddha in the *Sāmaññaphala Sutta* describes the position of a slave as a server rising up earlier, sleeping later, always waiting for the bidding, working to please, speaking to flatter, and looking to another person for favour (*puṇḍrubhūthāyī pachchhā-nipātī kimkāra-paṭissāvī manāpa-chārī piyavādī mukhullokako*). A female slave passed as *dāsī*. The *Vidhurapaṇḍita Jātaka* (No. 545) speaks of four kinds of slaves : those by birth (*āmāya dāsā*), those by purchase (*dhanena kītā*), those by choice (*sayam upayanti*), and those by fear (*bhayā bhavanti*). As Dr. Atindra Nath Bose (I.C., IV, p. 438) contends, "The argument that the *Arthaśāstra* knows of four kinds of slaves while *Manu* seven and *Nārada* fifteen was put forth from oversight." The *Arthaśāstra* (III. 13) refers to (1) *udaradāsa*, evidently the same as *Manu's bhaktadāsa* and *Medhātithi's annadāsa*, slave for food, and the Pali slave by choice ;

2. *krīta*, the same as *Manu's krīta* and the Pali *dhanakkīta*, purchased with money ;
3. *āhitaka*, acquired by mortgage, apparently a subhead of (2) ;
4. *sakṛidātmahatā*, those by voluntary enslavement, the same as the Pali *sayam upagatā*, a subhead of *Manu's bhaktadāsa* ;
5. *daṇḍapranītā*, enslaved by court decree, the same as *Manu's daṇḍadāsa*, a subhead of the Pali *bhayabhītā* ;
6. *grihaja*, born in the house, the same as *Manu's grihaja*, a subhead of the Pali *āmāya* or *yonito dāsā*.
7. *dāyagatā*, acquired by inheritance from ancestors, the same as *Manu's paitṛika*, a subhead of the Pali *āmāya dāsā* ; and
8. *dhvajāhṛitā*, captured in war, the same as *Manu's dhvajāhṛitā*, a subhead of the Pali *bhayabhītā*.

*Manu's dattrimas* denote the dedicated slaves (*prītyā adṛishṭārthaṁ dattāḥ*, *Medhātithi*), e.g., those dedicated to the service. The *Arthaśāstra* list "embraces almost all the varieties cited by *Nārada* (V. 26-28) only under more numerous subheads except a few which may have been a later development." There are statements in the Pali *Nikāyas* to show that male and female slaves were received as gifts by certain sects of the *Sramaṇas* and the *Brāhmaṇas*. *Buddhaghosa* defines *kammakaraporisā* as *avasitṭha-bhatta-vetana-bhatā kammakarā*, "the working people other than slaves are those employed on meals and wages," i.e., household servants, wage-earners, day labourers, or hirelings. England may rightly boast that she gave the lead to the Western countries in the matter of abolishing slavery in 1833. But so far as the whole of the earth is concerned, India well played the rôle of the liberator of men from all forms and degrees of bondage and the ameliorator of the worldly condition of the slaves and servants.

The Buddha prohibits five trades on the part of a lay worshipper (*Aṅguttara-N., Pañchaka Nipāta, Upāsakavagga*), the second of which is *sattavaṇijjā*, ex-



plained by Buddhaghosa as *manussa-vaṇijjā*, 'traffic in human beings'. In the *Sāmaññaphala Sutta*, he paints slavery or servitude as a state of woe and compares it with the state of indebtedness, disease, imprisonment and journey across a wilderness. Similarly he describes emancipation from servitude as a state of relief and compares it with the state of release from debts, recovery from illness, coming out of prison and safe crossing of a wilderness :

*yathā iṇaṃ yathā rogaṃ yathā bandhanāgāraṃ yathā dāsavyaṃ yathā kantā-raddhānamaggaṃ. Yathā āṇanyaṃ yathā ārogyaṃ yathā bandhanā mokkhaṃ yathā bhujissaṃ yathā khemantabhūmiṃ.*

He pathetically defines a slave as "a person who is not under his own will, who is completely under the will of another person, who cannot exercise his free will." The diametrically opposite is the condition of a free man.

*Seyyathā pi puriso dāso assa anattādhīno parādhīno na yena-kāmaṃ-gamo, so apareṇa samayena tamhā dāsavyā muchcheyya attādhīno aparādhīno bhujisso yena-kāmaṃ-gamo.* Kauṭilya (*Arthaśāstra*, III. 13) says : "It is no crime for the *Mlechchhas* to sell or mortgage their own offsprings. But servitude is not the condition of an Aryan (*na tu āryeshu dāsabhāvaḥ*). His statement regarding the *Mlechchhas* has its corroboration from the Buddha who in the *Assalāyana Sutta*, *Majjhima Nikāya*, states that the social system of the Yaunas, Kāmbojas and such other north-western frontier peoples admitted just a distinction between the status of a master and that of a slave without, however, implying an impassable barrier between the two.

As for humane treatment of the slaves and hirelings, the Buddha enjoins in the *Singālovāda Sutta* that the master should fulfil his duty towards his slaves and hirelings in these five ways : "by assigning to them work according to their strength (*yathābalaṃ kammanta-saṃvidhānena*), by supplying them with food and wages (*bhatta-vetanānuppādena*); by tending them in sickness (*gilānu-paṭṭhānena*); by sharing with them unusual delicacies (*achchhariyānaṃ rasānaṃ saṃvibhāgena*); by granting them leave at times (*samaye vossaggena*): i.e., by constant relaxation so that they need not work all day, and special leave with extra food and adornment for festivals (Commentary) (Mookerji, Asoka, p. 154). It is not only that the Buddha himself abstained from receiving the slaves, male and female, as gift (*dāsi-dāsa-paṭiggahaṇā paṭivirato Samaṇo Gotamo*, *Dīgha-N.*, I, p. 5.) but restrained his disciples from it. Aśoka does not tell us what he precisely meant by seemly behaviour to or proper treatment of the slaves and servants. The very word *bhataka*, Sk. *bhṛitaka*, implies that by 'servants' he meant paid servants or hirelings. Kauṭilya (*Arthaśāstra*, III. 15, 16) prescribes certain rules to safeguard the socio-economic and personal interests of the slaves and hirelings, in the light of which one may try to understand Aśoka's principle. This is not to say with Mookerji (Asoka, p. 154) that what Aśoka meant by proper treatment of the slaves and paid servants was "the treatment to which they were entitled under the law as expounded by Kauṭilya." To say this will be to assume that Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*, as we now have it, is



earlier than Aśoka's edicts, which is still a highly debatable point of Indian chronology.

The rules prescribed by Kauṭilya concerning the proper treatment of slaves may be divided into two groups : one meant to protect them against the wrongs done them by the master, and the other to grant them privileges under the law, manumission included.

The rules of the first group provide sanction against such offences as deceiving a slave of his money or depriving him of the privileges he can exercise as an *Ārya*, employing a slave to carry dead bodies or to sweep ordure, urine and leavings of food, requiring a female slave to attend on her master while he is in his bath-room, hurting or abusing a slave, violating the chastity of a female slave, committing or helping to commit rape with a female slave, employing a slave in mean avocations against his will, selling or pledging a pregnant female slave without providing for her confinement, failing to set a slave at liberty on receipt of ransom, putting a slave under confinement for no reason (*akāraṇāt samrodhah*).

Those of the second group enjoin that the life of an *Ārya* should be redeemed from bondage by his kinsmen, if it is mortgaged to tide over family troubles, to pay fines, to satisfy court decrees, or to recover the confiscated household assets ; that the offspring of a man who has sold himself off as a slave should be recognised as an *Ārya* ; that a slave, whether born or pledged, should be entitled to regain his *Āryahood* on payment of the value for which he is enslaved ; that an *Ārya* made captive in war should be allowed to regain his freedom on payment of required ransom ; that when a child is begotten on a female slave by her master, both the child and its mother should at once be recognised as free, at all events the children ; that a slave should enjoy not only what he has earned without prejudice to his master's work but also the inheritance from his father ; and that the property of a slave should pass into the hand of his natural heirs.

As regards *karmakaras* or labourers, Kauṭilya prescribes (*Arthaśāstra* III, 15, 16) that the servant shall get his wages as per agreement between him and his employer, which should be known to the neighbours ; that in case wages are not previously settled, the amount shall be fixed in proportion to the work done and the time spent ; that if wages are not previously settled, a cultivator shall be entitled to 1/10th of the crops grown, a herdsman to 1/10th of the butter clarified, and a trader to 1/10th of the sale proceeds ; that artisans, musicians, physicians, buffoons, cooks, and other professionals, serving of their own accord, shall be entitled to as much wages as similar persons employed elsewhere get or as much as experts shall fix ; that workmen employed by guilds and those who jointly carry on any work shall divide their earnings either equally or as per agreement among themselves ; that the *bhṛitaka* shall be entitled to his legal wages as well as reasonable concession if he is incapable of work, or is put to ugly work, or is ill, or is in distress (cf. Mookerji, *Asoka*, p. 154 f.).



Kauṭilya's laudable prescriptions are offered to safeguard the interests of an *Ārya* and based on the assumption that servitude is not the condition of an *Ārya*, while the *Mlechchhas* are left to be guided by their time-honoured customs and usages. Aśoka, on the contrary, promulgated his *dharma-niyamas* or regulations based upon the principles of piety for the benefit of all sections of people within his empire, including the Yaunas, Kāmbojas Gāndhāras, and others whom Kauṭilya would count among the *Mlechchhas*.

4. garūṇaṃ : Here the denotation of the term *gurū* is wider than that in R. E. XIII, and M. R. E. (Si. Bra, Ye). Here it stands for parents, teachers (*āchariyā*), and others. The *gāthās* cited from the Saṃyutta Nikāya (*ante*, p. 53) suggest a definition, according to which, the *gurus*, e.g., mother, father, elder brother and teacher, to whom one should maintain a reverential attitude, who should be respected and truly honoured, (*tesu assu sagāravo, tyassa apachitā assu, tyassu sādhu supūjitā*).

5. apachiti : According to Buddhaghosa, *apachiti* is *nīchavuttitāya pūjanā*, 'honouring with submissiveness, humility or humbleness of spirit.'

6. sādhu dana itī, dāna sādhu ti : The dictum is evidently a quotation, and its source, the Sādhu Sutta, is now traceable in the Saṃyutta-N. I, p. 20. The Sutta may even deserve to be called Sādhu-dāna-sutta from its main theme. The dictum, *pāṇesu sayamo sādhu*, is traceable to the same source. The same as to the dictum, *na tu etārisaṃ dānaṃ yārisaṃ dhammadānaṃ*. The Pali Sādhu Sutta puts the following dicta, quite Buddhistic in tone and spirit, into the mouth of a deity (*devatā*) :

1. *Saddhāya pi sāhu (sādhu) dānaṃ*.  
"A gift made out of faith, too, is good." Here the expression *saddhāya* means, according to Buddhaghosa 'believing in the Law of Karma and its Result' (*kammaṃ cha phalaṃ cha saddahitvā*).
2. *Appam pi che saddahāno dadāti | ten'eva so hoti sukhī parattha*.  
"Should even little a believer give away, by that alone he becomes happy hereafter."
3. *Dhammaladdhassāpi sādhu dānaṃ*.  
"A gift made to a realiser of the truth (a perfect saint) is also good".
4. *Uṭṭhāna-viriyādhigatassāpi sādhu dānaṃ*.  
"A gift made to an aspirant, wakeful and energetic, is also good".
5. *VicHEYya-dānaṃ pi Sugatappasattham*.  
"The discriminate charity, too, is praised by the Buddha".
6. *Pāṇesu sādhu saṃyamo*.  
The practice of restraint as regards living creatures is good.



7. *Dānā cha kho dhammapadam va seyyo.*

“The true state of beatitude is better than gifts” (Buddhaghosa).

“The (gift of) a text of the Doctrine is better than (earthly) gifts”.

This is the same as to saying—*Sabbadānaṃ dhammadānaṃ jīnāti.*

The Sādhū Sutta may be said to have in its background the valedictory address in the Taittirīya Upanishad, I. 11. 3, which stresses the following points : *Śraddhayā deyam. Aśraddhayā deyam. Śriyā deyam. Hriyā deyam. Bhiyā deyam. Samvidā deyam.* According to the Sādhū Sutta, the *bhaya* or fear is the fear of public criticism, (*parūpavāda-bhaya*).

7. *dhammadānaṃ dhammānugaho* : In the Aṅguttara-N. I, p. 78 f., *dhamma-dāna* is contrasted with *āmisadāna* and *dhammānugaha* with *āmisānuggaha*. Here *dhammadāna* corresponds to the *brahmadāna* of Manu, IV. 233. Buddhaghosa defines *dhammadāna* as a gift of the knowledge of the path to the immortal state (*amatupphattiṃ paṭipadam*), and *āmisadāna* as a gift of earthly requisites. Similarly he distinguishes between *dhammānuggaha* and *āmisānuggaha* as favouring with a knowledge of the path to the immortal state and favouring with earthly requisites. In Aśoka's phraseology, *dhammadāna* consists in giving a knowledge of the Law of Piety or Duty, and *dhammānugaha* in favouring with a knowledge of the same. Thus *chakhudāna* (P.E. II) may be treated just as a synonym of *dhammadāna*.

8. *mitrena va suhadayena vā nātikena va sahāyena vā* : Here are four terms of personal relationship implied by the four words, *mitra*, *suhada* (Sk. *suhṛida*), *nāti* (Sk. *jñāti*), and *sahāya*. In R. E. XI (G) we have *mita-sastuta-nātikena*, in R. E. XIII, *mita-samthuta-sahāya-nātikesu* (Ye) ; in R. E. IV, simply *nātisu*, and so also in R. E. V and P. E. IV. We are to understand in the case of *mitra* and the rest, where one is mentioned, others are understood, while *nātika* stands apart from them. The *mitra*, *suhada*, and the rest are comprehended by the Sanskrit expression *bāndhavaḥ*. The *mitra* group is represented in Pali by the word *mittāmachchā* (Siṅgālovāda Sutta), cp. *nāti-suhajjā* in the Lakkhaṇa Suttanta. The Pali scholiast Buddhaghosa is inconsistent in his explanation of the same word *nāti* in two different senses : first, in that of *dāyādas*, ‘heirs’, or ‘inheritors’ in respect of the expression *nātimajjhagato*, and in that of relations on the side of mother-in-law and father-in-law (*nāti ti sassu-sasura-pakkhikā*) in respect of the oft-recurring expression *nāti-sālohitā*. Evidently the second word *sālohitā*, ‘having blood relationship’, defines *nāti*, in which case *nāti* must primarily mean a blood-relation. This is precisely the meaning of the word *nāti* or *nātikā* as employed in Aśoka's edict. In R. E. V, the kinsmen are typified by brothers and sisters (*bhātinam cha me bhagininaṃ cha e vāpi amne nātike*). Thus both agnates and cognates, primarily the agnates, are meant by the word *nātikā*.



The word *mitra* is a general term for all classes of friends, the friends in general, and the rest may be regarded as subheads of *mitra*. The *saṁstutas* are persons with whom one keeps association (*saṁthava*), the associates. When used alone, the word *saṁstūta* means not only associates but comrades, companions, and the rest. By *mitra* is generally meant in Pali *kalyāṇa-mitra* or well-disposed friend. *Sakhā* is just another term for *mitra* (Siṅgālovāda Sutta). According to this Sutta, the four classes of *mitras* deserve to be called *suhada* or 'bosom friend', namely, a friend who renders good personal service (*upakāro mitto*), a friend who is a true sympathiser in weal and woe (*saṁāna-sukha-dukkho*), a friend who points out things that are of real advantage (*atthakkhāyī*), and a friend who is truly compassionate (*anukampako*).

Buddhaghosa defines *sahāya* as *sahaṁ yāti ti sahāyo, sahaṅgamo, sahacharo*, "one who goes together with, one who accompanies, a companion, a helping friend."

9. *e hi itale magale* (Ye, K, M, G), *ye hi etake magale* (Sh) : *Lit.*, "that which indeed is the other *maṅgala*", "that which indeed is this *maṅgala*". Here *itale*=Pali *itaram*, Sk. *itaram*. When the word *itaro* is used alone, it means in Pali "the other", "the second", cp. *itaro āha*. But when used as an adjective, such as in the phrase *itaro jano* (Dhammapada, verse 222), it means the person other than one mentioned last. The same as to *itare* in the Sanskrit saying—*miṣṭānnam itare janāḥ*. Thus it is difficult to interpret Aśoka's expression *itale magale* in the sense of the second *maṅgala*, i.e., the *dhamma-maṅgala*. The Shahbhazgarhi variant *etake magale*, "this *maṅgala*", refers certainly to the *dharma-maṅgala*. Going by the literary usage, the expression *itale magale* cannot but be taken to refer to the *maṅgala* other than the *dhammamamaṅgala*. The race between the two variants has given rise to two different constructions of the text, each with its own justification (*ante*, pp. 55, 188). In support of the construction suggested on the strength of Sh variant *etake magale*, I may just draw attention to the Sāmaññaphala Sutta in which the Buddha has tried to convince the interrogator, king Ajātasatru, that religion is not to serve other-worldly interests only. But that was the prevalent belief among the people of India. So doubt might arise as to the efficacy of the *dharma-maṅgala* advocated by Aśoka in so far as this world was concerned, and Aśoka had to put forth an argument to show that it was advantageous also to this world, admitting all the while that its main bearing was on the life hereafter. The fruit promised, in the Pali Sādhū Sutta for the gift made by a person with a believing heart is just that the donor will be happy hereafter (*ten'eva sukhī parattha*). In R. E. X, Aśoka declares, in consonance with the Jātaka dictum (*ante*, p. 60), that what little he exerted himself, all that was for the sake of the hereafter (*savaṁ pāra-trikāya*). The argument, however, is continued into R. E. XI and he concludes it by saying that by the practice of *dhammadāna*, *dhammasaṁstava*, and the like



this world is secured and unbounded merit is earned for the world beyond. This conclusion is in accord with Jaimini's definition of *Dharma* as a method of conduct whereby *abhyudaya* (rise in this life) and *piśreyas* (*ne pas ultra*) are obtained as well as numerous declarations in the Pali Piṭakas, the Jaina Āgama and the Sanskrit Epics.

#### As to R. E. X :—

##### 1. *dhammavutaṃ anuvidhiyatāṃ* (G), *dhammayutaṃ anuvidhiyatu :*

Before the Yerraguḍi text was available we had just the choice between these two equations of *dhammavutaṃ*, namely, *dharmoktam* (utterances of *Dharma*, Bhandarkar) and *dharmavṛittam* (observances of *Dharma*, Mookerji). But now the choice lies also between these two, *dharmavṛittam* and *dharmayuktam* (that which is connected with piety). To keep symmetry with the first clause *dhamma-susruṃsā susrusatāṃ*, the second clause ought to have read *dhammavutaṃ* [*vidhānaṃ*] *cha anuvidhiyatāṃ*, with *dhammayutaṃ* [*vidhānaṃ*] as a variant in Ye. In R. E. XIII, we have *dhammavutaṃ vidhānaṃ dhammānusathi cha*. Bhandarkar and Mookerji who agree in treating them as three separate terms, translate them by "the utterances of *Dhamma*, the ordinances, and the instructions in *Dhamma*" and "practice, ordinances and injunctions of *Dharma*" respectively. In R. E. IX, *vutaṃ* stands certainly=*vuttaṃ* or *uktaṃ*, but this equation does not fit in with Ye variant *dhammayutaṃ*, which is=*dharmayuktaṃ*, the same word as *dhārmikaṃ*. As to the context of R. E. XIII, instead of treating *dhammavutaṃ vidhānaṃ* as two separate terms, one is justified in regarding them as one, *dhammavutaṃ* or *dhammayutaṃ* being an adjective to *vidhānaṃ*, cp. *dhammena vidhānaṃ* in P. E. II. In any case, *vidhānaṃ* must be treated as a shorter expression of *dhamma-vidhānaṃ*.

##### 2. *savaṃ pātrikāya :* See note 9 under R. E. IX (*ante*, p. 211).

#### As to R. E. XII :—

1. *sava-pāsaṃdāni pūjayati :* With this statement of Aśoka may be compared the description of Khāravēla as one who honoured all sects (*sava-pāsaṃdā-pūjako*, Hāthigumphā Inscription).

2. *sāraṇadhī :* Lit., "the growth of substance", "growth in essence". *Sāra* is primarily a botanical term, meaning 'pith', e.g., *rukṣhasāra*, the substantial



part of a tree as distinguished from its branches, twigs, fibres and bark (Sāropama Sutta, Majjhima—N. I). It is also a chemico-medical term, meaning essence or extract got by distillation. As a philosophical term, it means substance or underlying element of reality, e.g., in the Dhammapada verses, 11-12 :

*Asāre sāramatino, sāre chūsāradassino |  
sārañ cha sārato ñatvā, asārañ cha asārato ||*

As an academic term, *sāra* means the substance, essential theme or underlying thought and purpose of a literature, cp. Aupapātika Sūtra, Sec. 77 : *Vedānam sārāgā pārāgā dhāragā* ; the Jaina scholiasts equate *sārāgā* with *smarakāḥ*.

We also come across *sāra* as a religious term in such expressions as *sārappatto*, *sāre paṭiṭṭhito* (Vinaya Sutta-vibhaṅga, Verañjakaṇḍa ; Aṅguttara—N., chatukkanipāta, Yodhājīva-vagga, 10). Buddhaghosa explains *sāra* as meaning *sīlādisāra*, *sīla-samādhi-paññā-vimutti-vimuttiñānadassana-guṇā*, "such qualities as moral virtue, higher vision and experience through mental concentration, knowledge of the truth and means of its realisation, emancipation of consciousness, and inner faith in one's emancipation, born of knowledge."

In the edict, too, *sāra* is employed as a religious term. According to Aśoka, piety and virtue (*dhamma*, *sīla*) constitute the *sāra* or essence of all religions. Cp. R. E. IV : *dhammamhi sīlamhi tiṣṭaṃto*.

In R. E. XII, Aśoka says that growth in the essence of things is of various kinds, though at the root of it is *vachīguti* or restraint of speech. Here by *sāravaḍḍhi* he wanted to find men of all denominations *bahusrutā* (well-informed of different views and systems) and *kalyāṇāgamā* (possessed of a sound tradition, of a sound scripture). This was possible only by the cultivation of the spirit of tolerance and healthy co-operation.

✓3. *vachīguti* : Lit., "restraint of speech". Here it is used in a very special sense. It is that kind of restraint of speech which is indispensable to the practice of religious toleration. It demands of all sects that none should unduly extol his own sect and unreasonably and unnecessarily criticise other sects, and that criticism, even though not without point, shall be as light as possible.

✓4. *samavāya* : "concord". This represents the co-operative side of Aśoka's toleration. By this Aśoka meant that the different sects should not only learn one another's doctrine but be eager to do so, so that all may become well-informed and guided by a sound tradition.

✓5. *etāye aṭṭhāye viyāpaṭā dhammamamahāmātā ithidhiyakha-mahāmātā vachabhūmikā cha aṃne nikāyā* : "For this purpose are employed the *Dharmamahā-mātras*, the *Stryadhyakshamahāmātras*, the *Vrachabhūmikas* and other classes of



officials." The purpose is stated in R. E. XII, and partly in R. E. V and P. E. VII, and it is threefold : (1) to distribute gifts among the different sects and do them honour in various ways ; (2) to encourage them to restrain their speech with a view to the practice of tolerance ; and (3) to persuade them to co-operate with one another for their growth in essential matters of religion and enable them to be well-informed and possessed of a sound tradition. Here we have just to consider how the above classes of officers might be instrumental to the threefold purpose.

P. E. VII shows that the task fell mainly to the share of the *Dharmamahāmātras*, for they alone represented the special class of officials concerned with all sects of recluses and householders without distinction, while the sectarian *Mahāmātras* were specifically occupied with this or that sect. As stated in R. E. V, it was their special mission to establish the Law of Piety, to effect an increase in conformation to the norm of conduct, and to work for the good and happiness of the virtuous among all sects. The same edict records that they were the body of officials required to assist all, including the king, his family members, brothers, sisters, and other kith and kin, when they were found inclined to piety, relying on the Law of Piety, or given to charity.

Regarding the *Stryadhyaksha Mahāmātras* it is not enough to say with Bhandarkar (Aśoka, p. 115) that they were "officers who were concerned with the welfare and happiness of women", or that "sectarian fervour and intolerant spirit were being displayed by women also". As Raychaudhuri has sought to show, the *Stryadhyakshas* or *Dārādhyakshas* were the officers who served as "Guards of the Wives" or Superintendents of Women of the king's household. From the Epic descriptions, it is clear that they were to see to the safety of the queens and their female retinues whenever they were sent out under their care. The Pali *Antepura-upachāraka* or *Orodha-mahāmattas* were indeed the high officers who were placed in charge of the inmates of the king's household. The Buddhist legends in Pali and Sanskrit go to prove that the queens had their own *gurus* or religious preceptors who had a free access to them, and that in the same royal family if one brother (say, Aśoka) was a staunch supporter of the Buddhist *śramaṇas*, another brother even with his position as the crown prince (say, Tissa or Viśāoka) was a strong supporter of the *Ājīvikas*. As regards Tissa or Viśāoka, we are told that he maintained at first the typical cynical attitude of the *Ājīvikas* towards the *Śākyabhikṣus* who appeared to have led a life of ease and comfort as compared with the austere life of the *Tāpasas*, *Nirgranthas* and *Ājīvikas*. These legends represent Tishyarakhitā as the later queen consort of Aśoka who was arrogantly hostile at first to his Buddhist faith and sacrilegiously irreverent towards the Buddhist *sanctum sanctorum*,—the Bodhidruma. The Vinaya Chullavagga, Ch. VII, narrates the story of the plot laid by Devadatta as the leader of a religious faction to get hold of prince Ajātasattu and instigate him to kill his father and its detection by the *Antepura-upachāraka Mahāmattas*. The story of Viśākhā in the Dhammapada-Commen-



tary records an instance where the marriage of a Buddhist girl into a family of lay Ājīvikas made her position awkward, owing to her disdain for the naked ascetics. There are Jātakas that speak of love-intrigues of the queens with some of the ascetics, and some, e.g., the Mahāmora and the Vidhurapaṇḍita, in which the queen persuades and ultimately compels her husband to have a wise person brought to her for religious instructions. The Gāthās of Sister Chāpā attest how sometimes the recluses and ascetics had to run a moral risk on coming into contact with women. The Vinaya Piṭaka bears a clear testimony to the fact that the *bhikkhus* as well as the *bhikkhunīs* were disruptive factors in the Sangha, and the same is attested also by Aśoka's Schism Pillar Edict. Among the female votaries of different faiths were not only the queens and courtezans but other aristocratic ladies and common women.

Mookerji (Aśoka, p. 161) observes: "Regarding women, perhaps it was necessary to preach the *dharma* of toleration to them as a class! That there were *Mahāmātras* attached to the royal harem is also indicated by Kauṭilya (I. 10): because they had to deal with ladies, their special qualification emphasised is sexual purity (*kāmopadhāśuddhān*), and they are to be placed in charge of the places of pleasure both in capital and outside. . . . Again, in the Vinaya (Vol. iv, p. 158), there is a reference to the appointment of religious preachers for the royal harem (*itthāgāraṃ dhammaṃ vāchehīti*)".

Thus the *Stryadhyaksha Mahāmātras* might serve the purpose of the edict at least by enabling the different sects to receive gifts and donations and win reverence from the womenfolk, particularly from those of a royal family, by guarding the women and the recluses against moral risks, and by enabling the women of India to be acquainted with different creeds and ideals of life.

The part played by the *Vrachabhūmikas* in this respect depends on their actual official position, which is still a matter of conjecture and speculation. Taking them to be the officers in charge of the high roads, Mookerji (Aśoka, p. 160) thinks that they could do useful work among the travellers including the pilgrims. Taking the *Vrachabhūmikas* to be the officers in charge of the places accessible to elephants, horses, and chariots, one may show that in M. R. E. (Ye) the elephant-riders and the chariot-trainers are included among the personal agents employed for circulating the king's message among the people. As Superintendents of fairs, festivals, dramatic performances and other popular pastimes, the *Vrachabhūmikas* might guard the adherents of different sects against moral dissipation, the *Śramaṇas* and the *Brāhmaṇas* who, according to the Brahmajāla and other Suttas of the Dīgha Nikāya, I, witnessed these entertaining and exciting sights (*visūkadassanā*). As Superintendents of roads, public parks, royal pleasantries, etc., along which the *Śramaṇas* and the *Brāhmaṇas* occasionally travelled or where they halted while *en route* to some place, the *Vrachabhūmikas* might extend equal facilities to all sects and prevent them from indulging in mutual recriminations and condemnation. The Pali Brahmajāla Sutta records an instance where, while



travelling along a high road between Rājagaha and Nālandā and while halting for a day at the Royal pleasure-garden called Ambalaṭṭhikā, the wandering ascetic Suppiya and his young disciple Brahmadaṭṭa were speaking, one in praise and the other in dispraise of the Buddha, his Doctrine and his Order, and expressing views that were in direct contradiction of each other. The Jachchanda Sutta in the Udāna, the Kalaha-vivāda, Mahāvīyūha and Chūlavīyūha Suttas in the Sutta-nipāta, and several other texts in the Pali Canon clearly show how the Śramaṇas and the Brāhmaṇas of various orders, severally criticised and rudely condemned each other and one another, whenever they met together, each sect adhering to its own dogma. Kauṭilya (Arthaśāstra, I. 10) advises the king to take care that his queens do not come in contact with the ascetics with shaved head or braided hair and such other outsiders, and that no commodities without careful examination and seal mark are allowed to pass into or out of the inner apartment (*antabhūmikam*).

It would seem that *vracha* (*vraja*) as a term denoting a structure of the palace stood for the royal parlour, and *vrachabhūmi* (*vrajabhūmi*) was the *goshṭha* or *goshṭhī* which is regarded as a synonym of *samajyā*, *parishat*, *sabhā*, *saṃiti*, *saṃsad*, *āsthānī*, and *āsthān* (Amarakośha, Brahmavarga, Nānārthavarga). The word *goshṭha* means both a place for cattle and a place where persons may come together for pleasant conversations, leisurely discussions, and social entertainments. If so, the *Vrachabhūmikas* were officers in charge of the royal parlour and social or popular gatherings.

Kauṭilya (Arthaśāstra, I. 20) speaks of *alaṅkārabhūmi* (toilet ground), *antabhūmi* (inner ground), *mantrabhūmi* (council ground), while Buddhaghosa speaks of *dovārika-bhūmi* (ground guarded by the door-keeper). Aśoka's *vrachabhūmi*, considered as a part of the ground, was either the recreation ground, or the walking-ground, or the stable ground.

As for other classes of officials employed for the purpose, attention might be drawn to P. E. VII, which refers to, the sectarian *Mahāmātras* and various departmental heads (*bahukā mukhā*) other than the *Dharmamahāmātras* who distributed royal gifts and charities among the different sects of recluses and householders. In the Sārnāth copy of the Schism Pillar Edict, the sectarian *Mahāmātras*, interested in Buddhism, are required to attend the *Posatha* service by turns with a view to ensuring unity and concord inside the *Saṅgha*.

#### As to R. E. XIII :—

1. bahu-tāvatake mate : "Many times as that died" (Hultsch and others).

I suggest, "as many as that died." The expression occurs in a context, where Aśoka gives definite figures of men captured and those killed in action. The first figure refers to men carried off as captives. The second to men wounded in



battle (*tatrāhate*), in which case the third clause must be construed as a statement regarding men who were killed in action and those who died owing to wounds and diseases and other reasons. As compared with the two preceding figures, the third could not have been overwhelmingly large. The intended figure is either the same as that relating to men wounded, or as the total made up of two preceding figures, i.e., 2,50,000, more or less.

2. *tivve dhramavaye* : By this Aśoka means to say how, as a result of deep reflections on the after effects of the Kalinga war, an intense religious tendency and longing for piety arose in him. As Raychaudhuri wants to suggest, there was already such a tendency or longing before, and it only became intensified. It was usual with the Indian kings to have religious and philosophical discussions with the wise men and saintly personages on suitable occasions. If we can believe in the Pali legend, Aśoka's father Bindusāra was a lay supporter of various religious sects other than the Buddhist, and Aśoka, too, remained attached to them before embracing the Buddhist faith.

3. *iyam pi chu tato gulumatatale* : This means that culture is the greater casualty in war than a mere loss of life and property.

4. *amne va pāsāṃḍā gihathā va* : The final conjunction has led the Aśokan scholars to separate *gihathā*, "householders", from *amne pāsāṃḍā*, "other sects", "other denominations". As shown in note 4 under R. E. V, the recluses (*pavajitas*) are represented in the edicts, precisely as in literature, by the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Śramaṇas*. The statement in R. E. XII, *sava-pāsāṃḍāni pavajitāni gilathāni va*, is conclusive as to there being the *pravrajita* as well as *grihastha pāṣaṇḍas*.

5. *agabhuti-susūsā* : Here the first member of the compound is taken by Bühler to mean *agrajanman* or 'a member of a higher caste', or 'a Brāhmaṇa'. It means "those who receive high pay (*agrabhṛiti*)", according to Hultsch, and 'elders', according to Mookerji. Hultsch's equation of *bhuti* with *bhṛiti* is not justified, because in the case of *bhṛitaka* in the same edict we have *bhataka* or *bhaṭaka*, and not *bhutaka* or *bhuṭaka*. The equation must be with *bhūti*. The recluses were not expected to pay respectful attention to high officials. In the list the *agabhutis* stand even before the parents. In the Sīṅgālovāda Sutta scheme the *Śramaṇas* and the *Brāhmaṇas* are placed in the zenith, the slaves and hirelings in the nadir, the parents in the eastern quarter, the wife and children in the western, the teachers and preceptors in the southern, and the friends and comrades in the northern. In this edict we have mention of parents, *gurus*, friends and relatives, and slaves and servants. The wives and children are omitted in the edicts but not the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Śramaṇas*.



I prefer 'high personages' as an English rendering of *agabhuti*. It is indeed the same honorific as *agrajanman* in Manu's line : *asmin deśe prasūtasya sakāśād agra-janmanah*, or *agga* (applicable to the Buddha) and *agganikkhittakā* (applicable to the Disciples placed in foremost ranks) as in the *Dīpavaṃsa* expressions, *agga-santike gaheṭvā, agganikkhittakā therā*.

6. *suvihitā* : "(those) well provided for" (Hultzsch, Mookerji). I prefer "those who are well controlled, well established in the Law of Piety or Duty." Corresponding to Aśoka's *suvihitānaṃ*, we have *suvihitānaṃ* in the Theragāthā (*ante*, p. 74) and *samana-suvihitānaṃ* in the Hāthigumphā Inscription. In the edict itself Aśoka explains the word as meaning *yesu vihitā esa agabhutisusūsā*, etc.

7. *tato satabhāge va sahasabhāge va aja gulumate* : "a hundredth or thousandth part thereof is considered today a serious matter". The statement may be shown to be psychologically true. The feeling is intensified by subsequent reflection on an action and its consequences.

8. *yā aṭaviyo Devānaṃpiyasa [vijite hoti]* : By this Aśoka referred to all the *Aṭavis* or *Āṭavikas* who lived in his domain. From the context, it is clear that they were either predatory tribes under different chiefs or gangs of thieves under different leaders (*aṭaviyo ti chorā*, Jātaka, VI p. 55) who lived by plunder and theft and had to be kept in check. According to the *Arthasāstra*, there was a special class of officials called *Aṭavīpālas* to take care of them. The *aṭavi* in the sense of jungle tracts inhabited by semi-independent aboriginal tribes or used as hiding places by the gangs of thieves were not confined to any particular place. The Jātakas clearly show that *aṭavis* in this sense existed in each kingdom, and the ruler of each kingdom had to reckon with the permanent, or temporary dwellers of those areas. Aśoka sought to control them by a restricted use of his great power, and more, where possible, by his solicitude for them. But it is in the above general sense of all predatory peoples including the gangs of thieves that Aśoka appears to have referred to the *Aṭavis* or *Āṭavikas* in his domain, and not in the restricted sense of 'the eighteen Forest Kingdoms (*Āṭavī-rājya*)', mentioned in one of the copper-plate grants of the Gupta period, the tiny kingdoms that 'must have extended from Bāghelkhand right up almost to the sea-coast of Orissa' (Bhandarkar's Aśoka, p. 47). According to Buddhaghosa (*Atthasālinī*, p. 245), the Frontier officers (*Pachchantavāsino mahāmattā*, same as Aśoka's *Amṭa-mahāmātā*) were entrusted with the duty of severely dealing with the gangs of rebels, thieves or plunderers who, when chased, entered a mountainous region (*pabbataṃ pavisiṃsu*). It was with a great pluck that they could be captured, killed, punished and weakened.



9. *anutape cha pabhāve* : "regret and power", regret for having had to kill or punish the rebels or mischief-makers, and power was the capacity to punish (*pabhāvo daṇḍaḥ tejo*, *Abhidhānappadīpikā*, *Bhūkaṇḍa*, 351). Cf. *Arthaśāstra*, II. 21 : *esha rājñah prabhāvaḥ*.

10. *samachariyam* : In Pali, the two words, *dhammachariyā* and *samachariyā*, go together (*Kosala-sāmyutta*, *Sāmyutta I*), and *Buddhaghosa* treats them as synonyms (*vevachanāni*). The word *sama* (Sk. *śama*) literally means subduedness or calmness, the subdued condition of the self resulting from the practice of self-restraint. This well suits the Aśokan context where *samachariya* occurs in a category of four terms : *savabhūtānam achhati*, *sayama*, *samachariya* and *mādana*.

11. *dhammavijaya* : In the present edict, *dhammavijaya* stands as an antithesis to *sarasaka* or *sayaka vijaya*, the conquest by the force of arms typified by arrow or bow. Aśoka's definition presents two sides of *dhammavijaya*. On its negative side, it insists on the abandonment of the idea of a new territorial conquest or what Raychaudhuri calls "aggressive militarism" and the preference of forbearance and light reprisal even in the case of a conquest by the force of arms. And on its positive side, it insists on the encouragement of the works of public utility, such as those mentioned in R. E. II, P. E. VII, and Queen's Edict, and the dispatch of envoys for an effective delivery of the message of piety in the neighbouring territories. In Raychaudhuri's opinion "the Aśokan conception of *Dhammavijaya* was similar to that described in the *Chakkavatti Sihanāda Sutta*, 'conquest not by the scourge, not by the sword, but by righteousness' [*adaṇḍena asatthena dhammena abhivijaya*]. It was different from the Hindu conception explained and illustrated by the *Mahābhārata* (XI. 59. 38-39), the *Harivaṃśa* (I. 41. 21), the *Kauṭīliya* [*Arthaśāstra*, XII. I] and the *Raghuvamśa* (IV. 43)." He aptly draws attention (*op. cit.*, p. 270) to the significant statement of Arrian that "a sense of justice prevented any Indian king from attempting conquest beyond the limits of India" (Arrian's *Indika*, sec. ix) ; cf. *Cambridge History of India*, I, p. 321).

As regards Aśoka, he is not known to have conquered and annexed any new territory to his vast empire after the conquest of Kalinga. In his foreign policy he took a great care to assure the bordering independent states of his sincere good will towards them and to allay their fear of an aggression from his side (S. R. E. II : *anuvigina mamāye huvevū ti asvaseyu cha sukhammeva lahevū mamate, no dukham*). Even in home administration Aśoka wanted the *Aṭavis* (*Āṭavyas*) to be aware of his regret as well as his power (R. E. XIII). But there is a veiled threat in Aśoka's solicitude for the *Antas* as well as the *Āṭavyas* : *khamisati ne lājā e sakiye khamitave*, "the king will forgive us, whom he can forgive" (S. R. E. II) ; *e pi aja apakaleya khamataviyamate va Devānampiyenā yaṃ sakiye khamitāve*, "even he who does mischief is considered today by the



Beloved of the gods pardonable, whom he can pardon" (R. E. XIII). However laudable and liberal is the principle, the tone is certainly dictatorial as is natural to a person who is fully conscious of his superior and great power but promises to deal leniently with the miscreants within the limit of patience and forbearance. The monoliths of Aśoka bearing the wheel and emblems of lion, bull, elephant and horse stand as tangible signs of his imperial authority as much conspicuously as symbols of superiority of the *Saddhamma* or religion of Buddha Śākyamuni, the cause of which was vigorously espoused by him.

In the face of these facts the question may arise—how far was Aśoka a true advocate of pacifism? Accepting the verdict of the *Gārgī Samhitā* (cited by Jayaswal in J.B.O.R.S., IV, p. 261) as to the ultimate effect of the *Dharmavijaya* (*viṣayaṁ nāma dhārmikam*) on the strength of Aśoka's empire, Raychaudhuri (*op. cit.*, pp. 288, 304) opines that the abandonment of the aggressive militarism of his forefathers and the adoption of a policy of *Dhammavijaya* by Aśoka "must have seriously impaired the military efficiency of his empire". The fact, however, is that the military aspect of Aśoka's administration is kept totally concealed from us in his few recorded edicts, which read, after all, like so many Convocation speeches delivered by H. E. the Viceroy and Governor General of India as Chancellor of an Indian University, touching matters academic and those of general good and having no occasion to refer to matters military. On the contrary, there is no evidence on record to show that Aśoka disbanded his army or that he was not always vigilant and fully prepared to meet the difficult and embarrassing situation arising either from the mischievous action of the *Antas* ('frontagers') without and the *Aṭavyas* (predatory tribes and gangs of thieves) within. While speaking of *Dhammavijaya* in the edict under notice Aśoka not only did not preclude but clearly anticipated circumstances under which his descendants and successors might have to resort to armed conquest or resistance. All that he insisted on was that, even as belligerents, they should avoid excesses as far as practicable in acts of reprisal. *:(ā)yakasi yevā viṣayasi khamti cha lahu-damḍataṁ cha lochayaṁtu*. In the literary background was the Jātaka motto that forbearance or power of resistance was a greater means of conquest than armed force (*Khantibalo yuddhabalaṁ vijetvā, hantvā adhammaṁ*, Dhamma-J. (Fausböll, No. 45).

In any case, Aśoka's mind was preoccupied with the idea of conquest, no matter whether the conquest to be achieved was a conquest by piety or one by the force of arms. His predilection was undeniably one for the first kind of conquest which, as recently observed by Mr. T. N. Ramachandran (Woolner Commemoration Volume), was not different in its fundamental character from that advocated in the *Arthaśāstra* and the *Mahābhārata*. My opinion coincides with that of Raychaudhuri, Mookerji and others. Let us first consider Kauṭilya's views. Kauṭilya (*Arthaśāstra*, XII. 1) distinguishes between three kinds of conquerors: *dharmavijayī* (just conqueror), *lobhavijayī* (greedy conqueror), and *asuravijayī* (demon-like conqueror). As he defines them, the first is satisfied with



mere obeisance on the part of the weaker king who seeks his protection ; the second is satisfied with what he can safely gain in land or money ; and the third satisfies himself not merely by seizing the land, treasure, sons and wives of the conquered, but by taking the life of the latter. As appears from Kālidāsa's description (Raghuvamśa, IV), the *dharmavijaya* consisted in depriving a defeated or weaker king of his glory but not of his territory (*śrīyaṁ jahāra na tu medinīm*). This is well exemplified by Raghu's traditional treatment of his rival, the lord of the Mahendra mountain, made captive and then released, the capture and liberation of the Deccan rulers by Samudragupta, and the subduing of the Rāṭhikas and Bhojakas and the Magadhan king Bahasatimita (Bṛihaspatimitra), by Khāravela. When some of the Śaka rulers and generals posed sometimes as *Dharmavijayī* (J.A.S.B., p. 343 ; Raychaudhuri, *op cit*, p. 433), presumably they acted on this very principle of *Dharmavijaya*. But was that precisely the Aśokan idea of *Dharmavijaya* ?

As I have sought to show, Aśoka's definition implied not only the respecting of territorial integrity of the frontagers but enabling them by peaceful means to appreciate and adopt the principles of piety that were calculated to uplift humanity and increase general good and happiness. The second aspect of Aśoka's *Dharmavijaya* is not explicit in the Hindu conception of *Dharmavijaya*.

11. *Am̐tiyoko, Tulamaye, Am̐tikini, Magā, Alikasudaro* : Here is the full list of the five Greek contemporaries and 'frontagers' of Aśoka who are introduced in R. E. II as 'the Ionian king Am̐tiyoka and even those (Ionian) kings who are the neighbours of the said Am̐tiyoka' (*Am̐tiyako Yonarājā ye vā pi tasa Am̐tiyakasa sāmīpaṁ rājāno*), and in the present edict as "within a distance of six hundred *yojanas* (leagues) where (reign) the Ionian king called Am̐tiyoka and beyond the said Am̐tiyoka four (Ionian) kings called Tulamaya and Am̐tikini and Makā and Alikasudara" (*a shashu pi yojanasateshu yatra Am̐tiyoko nama Yonaraja paraṁ cha tena Atiyokena chature 4 rajani Turamaye nama Am̐tikini nama Maka nama Alikasudaro nama*). In both the contexts, *Am̐tiyoka* finds mention as the nearest 'frontager' in relation to whom other four Greek rulers and contemporaries are introduced. The Indianisation of Hellenistic names is still as faithful and close to Greek as possible. So it is easy to equate *Am̐tiyoko* with Antiochus or Antiochos, *Tulamaye*, *Turamāyo* or *Turamaye* with Ptolemy, *Am̐tikeni*, *Am̐tikini* or *Am̐tekine* with Antigonas, *Makā* or *Magā* with Magas, and *Alikasudale*, *Alikasudare* or *Alikasudaro* with Alexander.

Of the five Greek contemporaries with whom Aśoka had friendly intercourse, Antiochus was evidently the nearest western 'frontager'. Aśoka's Am̐tiyoka is to be identified with Antiochus II Theos of Syria and Western Asia (261-246 B.C.), and not with his father Antiochus I Soter of Syria (280-261 B.C.), the son and successor of Seleukos Nikator (312-280 B.C.). Seleukos who figured



among the generals of Alexander the Great during the latter's Asiatic campaign, was at first a rival and afterwards an ally of Chandragupta Maurya. Thus as Seleukos happened to be a contemporary of both Chandragupta and his son Bindusāra-Amitrachates, so Antiochus I was a contemporary of both Bindusāra and his son Aśoka. Antiochus I lived until the 8th year of Aśoka's *abhisheka* which had seen the annexation of Kalinga to the Maurya empire. The Seleukidan empire must have extended eastward to the Indus valley, otherwise it would not have been possible for him to cede to Chandragupta "the proviness of the Paropanisadai, Aria, and Arachosia, the captials of which were respectively Kābul, Herāt and Kandahār, and also Gedrosia, the modern Belochistan" (V. A. Smith, Oxford History of India, p. 74). All that the defeated Greek invader received from the Indian king in return was but a "small equivalent in the shape of five hundred elephants." There being no evidence on record to show any further loss of territory on either side thereafter, it may be safely stated that the Asiatic empire of both the son and grandson of Seleukos abutted on the Indian empire of Bindusāra and Aśoka. The matrimonial alliance established between Seleukos and Chandragupta in fulfilment of the terms of peace, which is not known to have been repeated subsequently, deserves more than passing notice. Here we are to think of an Antiochus who reigned in Syria and Western Asia in the 12th and 13th years of Aśoka's *abhisheka*. Applying this criterion, we must rule out Antiochus I and plead convincingly for his son Antiochus II.

The nearest southern Greek 'frontager' of Antiochus I and Antiochus II was Turamaya or Tulamaya identified with Ptolemy II Philadelphus, king of Egypt (285-247 B.C.). This Ptolemy made himself by virtue of his long reign a contemporary to both Bindusāra and Aśoka. The nearest western Greek 'frontager' of Antiochus II was Am̐tikini or Antigonas Gonatas, king of Macedonia (276-246 B.C. ; 276-239 B.C., Beloch ; 278-230 B.C., Cambridge History, vol. I). The nearest western Greek 'frontager' of Ptolemy II was Makā, Magā or Magas, half brother of Ptolmy II and king of Cyrene in North Africa (300-258 B.C. c. 300—c. 250, Beloch). The nearest western Greek 'frontager' of Antigonas Gonatas was Alikasudara or Alexander of Epirus (272-258 B.C.; 272-c. 255 B.C., Beloch). It is only by *suggestio falsi* that Beloch regards Aśoka's Alikasudara as the same person as Alexander of Cornith (252-244 B.C.) who was non-existent in the 12th or 13th year of Aśoka's *abhisheka* (257 or 256 B.C.). To retain Alexander of Corinth in the list is to disturb the so far agreed date of Aśoka's *abhisheka* as 269 B.C. It is, of course, immaterial from Aśoka's point of view whether the intended contemporary was Alexander of Epirus or Alexander of Corinth except for the fact that historically closer was the relationship between Macedon and Corinth. One thing, however, is very clear and certain, namely, that there is a logical consistency between the two statements of Aśoka concerning his Greek friends or that the way of introducing them is systematic, which could



not have been possible, had not his knowledge of the relative topographical position of their territories stood on a firm footing.

Evidently the five Greek potentates were the direct descendants and successors of Alexandeer the Great's generals and supporters and their territories were but once component parts of the Greek empire left behind by the great Macedonian conqueror. It was indeed between the two empires, namely, the Mauryan and the Macedonian, that friendly intercourse and exchange of embassies remained possible until the reign of Aśoka. Aśoka expressly tells us that his *dūtas* did not travel beyond the territories of his five Greek friends (*yatra pi Devanāmpriyasa duta no vrachanti*). In dealing with the effect on India of Alexander's invasion, V. A. Smith briefly abserves (Oxford History, p. 66 f.): "Although the direct effects of Alexander's expedition on India appear to have been small, his proceedings had an appreciable influence on the history of the country. They broke down the wall of separation between west and east, and opened up four distinct lines of communication, three by land and one by sea. The immediate formation of Greek kingdoms in Western Asia ensured from the first a certain amount of exchange of ideas between India and Europe. The establishment of the Graeco-Bactrian monarchy in the middle of the third century B.C. brought about the actual subjugation of certain Indian districts by Greek kings. The Hellenistic influence on Indian art, which is most plainly manifested in the Gandhāra sculptures dating from the early centuries of the Christian era, may be traced less conspicuously in other directions. There is good reason to believe that Buddhist teaching was considerably modified by contact with the Greek gods, and that the use of images in particular as an essential element in the Buddhist cult was mainly due to Greek example. Whatever Hellenistic elements in Indian civilisation can be detected were all indirect consequences of Alexander's invasion. The Greek influence never penetrated deeply. Indian polity and the structure of society resting on the caste basis remained substantially unchanged, and even in military science Indians showed no disposition to learn the lessons taught by the sharp sword of Alexander." But for a comprehensive discussion of the interesting problem of Hellenistic influence on different aspects of Indian civilisation, the reader must be referred to Gauranga Nath Banerji's dissertation—Hellenism in Ancient India.

The edicts of Aśoka, on the other hand, lead us to consider not the legacy of Hellenism in Indian civilisation but the influence exercised by his scheme of *Dhammavijaya* on the Greek world and the peoples and races who inhabited the five Greek territories and adjacent countries. It was rather unusual with the late Professor Rhys Davids that he proved himself to be an extremist when he rather rudely challenged the veracity of Aśoka's statements and the reason of his claims concerning his Greek 'frontagers'. In his opinion (Buddhist India, p. 298 f.), "It is difficult to say how much of this is mere royal rodomontade. It is quite likely that the Greek kings are only thrown in by way of make-weight, as it were; and that no emissary had actually been sent there at all. Even had



they been sent, there is little reason to believe that the Greek self-complacency would have been much disturbed. Asoka's estimation of the results obtained is better evidence of his own vanity than it is of Greek docility. We may imagine the Greek amusement at the absurd idea of a 'barbarian' teaching them their duty ; but we can scarcely imagine them discarding their gods and their superstitions at the bidding of an alien king." I need not repeat here the criticism of this remark which obviously "smacks of prejudice", ably offered by Mookerji (Asoka, p. 77 f.) and Bhandarkar (Asoka, p. 161 f.). But certain salient points must be added to their arguments by way of a supplement.

i. The restricting of the list to five names, faithfully Indianised, cannot but speak of sincerity and accuracy on the part of Asoka.

ii. The orderly manner of introducing them, keeping evidently in view the contiguity of the five Greek territories, of that of Antiochus II to his own empire, of those of Ptolemy II and Antigonas Gonatas to that of Antiochus II, of that of Magas to that of Ptolemy II, and of that of Alexander to that of Antigonas Gonatas, precisely like that of introducing the *Antas* in the south, namely, the Cholas, the Pāṇḍyas, the Satiyaputras, the Keralaputras, and the Tāmraparnikas, was rendered possible only by a correct information about the relative geographical position of the territories concerned.

iii. The reality of the *dūtas* (envoys) despatched by Asoka to the *Antas*, including the five Greek 'frontagers', cannot be disputed. Asoka needed the employment of these agents not only to initiate or encourage various works of piety and public utility (R.E. II), not only to inculcate the principles of piety (R.E. XIII), not only to proclaim Asoka's happy messages of piety, year after year (M.R.E., Ye), but to assure his 'frontagers' of his sincere desire to respect their territorial integrity, and of his solicitude and good will (R.E. XIII).

iv. "The treaty with Seleukos of about 302 B.C. was followed by the despatch to the court of Asoka's grandfather of the famous envoy, Megasthenes, an officer of Arachosia, while Asoka's father, Bindusāra, received at his court the homage of the next envoy, Deimachos, from Antiochus Soter. A third envoy named Dionysios was sent to the court of Pāṭaliputra by Asoka's contemporary, Ptolemy Philadelphos of Egypt... either in his time, or in that of his father." These facts are recorded by the Greek writers and ignored in Indian literature. Similarly Asoka records the fact of the despatch of envoys by him to the courts and territories of his five Greek 'frontagers', and the Greek writers ignore it. The exchange of envoys by way of reciprocation of courtesy on either side was only too natural under the circumstances to be disbelieved. The Besnagar Garuḍa Pillar Inscription records the name of Heliodoros as a Bactrian Greek ambassador (*Yonadūta*) from Mahārāja Antialikita (Antialkidas) to the court of king Kāśīputra Bhāgabhadra.



v. However imperfect was the Greek knowledge of India in the pre-Alexandrian time, the stories then current in Greece went to depict India "as a land of righteous folks, of strange beasts and plants, of surpassing wealth in gold and gems" (Burf, History of Greece, p. 422).

vi. It is a well established fact that Alexander's military expedition directed to Asia and Africa was designed also to spread the Greek civilisation among the 'barbarians'. Accordingly many men of letters, including the Sceptic philosopher Pyrrho of Elis, and a follower of Democritus named Anaxarchus accompanied his troops.

vii. Megasthenes records in fragments more than one that Dandamis, the leader of one of the sects of Indian ascetics, was the typical spiritual antagonist in whom Alexander, "the conqueror of many nations, had found more than his match." The pronouncement of Dandamis on the imperfection and insecurity of Alexander as a man that he was not God, since he had to taste of death and had no right to be the world's master and on the perfect contentment and full security of himself, will ever be read with deep admiration for the proud self-consciousness of India's spiritual heritage. He said to Alexander's messenger : "Go, then, and tell Alexander this—Dandamis has no need of aught that is yours, and therefore will not go to you, but if you want anything from Dandamis come you to him." And Alexander, on receiving this report, felt a stronger desire to see Dandamis.

viii. Even in Porus of India Alexander found an earthly rival whose heroic spirit simply astonished him. The victor riding out to meet the old prince, was impressed by his stature and beauty, and asked him how he would fair be treated. "Treat me like a king," said Porus. "For my own sake," said Alexander, "I will do that."

ix. Megasthenes, the ambassador of Seleukos Nikator, observed : "All that has been said regarding nature by the ancients is asserted also by philosophers out of Greece, on the one part in India by the Brachmanes, and on the other in Syria by the people called the Jews." And further : "Their ideas about physical phenomena are very crude, for they are better in their actions than in their reasonings, inasmuch as their belief is in great measure based upon fables ; yet on many points their opinions coincide with those of the Greeks. . . . Concerning generation, and the nature of the soul, and many other subjects, they (the Brachmanes of India) express views like those maintained by the Greeks. They wrap up their doctrines about immortality and future judgment, and kindred topics in allegories, after the manner of Plato."

x. Aśoka in his R.E. XIII, frankly admits that prior to the date of promulgation of this edict the different bodies of the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Śramaṇas* had obtained a strong foothold in all parts of his empire with the notable exception



of the Yauna area (*añatra Yonesu*). But R.E. V, which was promulgated at about the same time, records the fact of the first appointment of the *Dharmamahāmātras*, one of whose main duties was to see to the safety of the preachers of all Indian sects, particularly of those who were working among the Yaunas, the Kāmbojas, the Gāndhāras, and such other peoples who were hostile to the Indo-Aryan religion, while R.E. XIII just records the results obtained by this means. It records in the same breath the good results obtained in the territories of his Greek and other 'frontagers'.

xi. None need lay overstress on the self-complacency of the Greeks, especially when the self-complacency of the best of Indians was much greater than theirs. They would think it far beneath their dignity to learn the ideal of human conduct from any other race. Even in the dispassionate judgement of Megasthenes, the Indian philosophers were a better people in actions than in reasonings. Aśoka did not want to teach the Greeks and other peoples any abstruse truths of philosophy. His was an active programme of piety, set out in a form acceptable to all alike. Even the Yaunas or Persianised Ionians within his empire did not at first accept the Indo-Aryan religion; later they had to. The Greeks, in spite of their great achievements in literature, philosophy, politics, sciences, mathematics and art, were inferior to the representative Indians in righteousness and ideal of human conduct. The mission of the Greeks was the domination of the world by conquest and enslavement. The mission of Aśoka on the other hand, aimed at the alleviation of sufferings of men and animals and the elevation of human nature here, there, everywhere, wherever possible.

12. *idha rājavisayamhi Yona-Kambo(jesu).....savata*: This statement is made just by way of contrast with the *Antas*. The expression *idha* in the present context means the same thing as *sarvata vijitamhi* in R.E. II, simply *sarvata* in R.E. VII: *sarvata save pāsāṃdā vaseyu*. The statement is somewhat ambiguous and admits of a twofold interpretation: either as (1) among the Yaunas, Kāmbojas, etc, in the king's dominions, or as (2) in the areas under the royal rule and among the Yaunas, the Kāmbojas, etc. (also within the royal domain). The second of the two must be preferred. The *rājavisaya* is not commensurate with the whole of Aśoka's *vijita* but the main portion of it which was under the king's administration, the tribal States of the Yaunas, the Kāmbojas, and the rest forming the lesser portion which was not directly under his rule, although they were all situated within his empire. So far as the *rājavisaya* was concerned, his task was easy. So the tribal States deserved special mention in the present edict as well as the fifth, inasmuch as their ruling peoples had different religious beliefs and social organizations of their own.

13. *dūtā*: Lit., 'envoys', 'emissaries', 'messengers', 'ambassadors.' The *dūtas*,



as pointed out by Bhandarkar and others, were to be counted among the king's officers. Their position is generally sought to be explained in the light of the Arthaśāstra which divides them into three classes, viz., (1) *Nisīṣṭārthāḥ* or Plenipotentiaries, (2) *Parimitārthāḥ* or Chargés d'Affairs, and (3) *Sāsanadharas* or Conveyers of royal writ to be compared with the *Lekhahāraḥ* of the Harsha-charita, Uchchhāsa II, (Raychaudhuri, *op. cit.*, p. 265). According to Buddha-ghosa (Sumaṅgala-vilāsinī, I.), the main duty of a *dūta* was to convey a message in the shape of a letter or writ (*dūteyyam dūtakammam paṇṇam vā sāsanam vā gahetvā tattha tattha gamanam*). According to Kauṭilya (Arthaśāstra, I. 16), the duties of an envoy (*dūta*) consisted in transmission of messages, maintenance of treaties, issue of ultimatum (*pratāpa*), gaining of friends, intrigue, sowing dissension among friends, fetching secret force, carrying away by stealth relatives and gems, gathering information about the movements of spies, bravery, breaking of treaties of peace, winning over the favour of the envoy and government officers of the enemy." But even according to Kauṭilya, the primary duty of a *dūta* consisted in a faithful delivery of the king's message. "Messengers are the mouthpieces of kings," says he. The Tevijja Sutta mentions by name the Brahmin *dūtas* of Magadha and Kośala who were otherwise heads of Vedic institutions, maintained on royal fiefs. Evidently they were cultural ambassadors as well persons occasionally employed for diplomatic service. The Mahāparinibbāna Suttaṅga goes to show that Sunīdha and Varshakāra, the two ministers of king Ajātaśatru of Magadha, were employed to sow the seeds of dissension among the Vṛji-Lichchhavis of Vaiśālī. They were by Kauṭilya's definition the *nisīṣṭārtha dūtas* or plenipotentiaries. It appears from Kauṭilya's statement that men of Brahmin caste were generally employed as *dūtas*, although in exceptional circumstances, even outcastes might be employed. In the case of missions of good will, the envoys appear to have been appointed from among the princes of the blood royal. So Kauṭilya recommends (Arthaśāstra, V. 6) the appointment of 'cognates' princes, and other chiefs of the royal family to visit the family of the king's friends'. The envoy despatched by king Devānampīya Tissa of Ceylon to the court of king Devānampīya Asoka of India was a nephew (sister's son) of his. The edicts of Asoka keep us in the dark as to the social and official status of his *dūtas*. Evidently his *dūtas* were despatched to the Aṭavis or Aṭavikas (wild chiefs and leaders of gangs of thieves) within his empire to deliver to them his message expressing his regret as well as his power to punish. Similarly they were despatched to the Yaunas, the Kāmbojas, the Gāndhāras, and the rest of the semi-independent tribal states within his empire, and to the courts and territories of the *antas* or 'frontagers' outside his empire for the triple purpose: (1) to make arrangements for two kinds of medical treatment and to do other works of public utility, (2) to convey the message of *Dhamma*, and (3) to express the king's good will as well as to warn them against the consequences of aggression. There is nothing to prevent us thinking that the *dūtas* as cultural ambassadors might



include the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Śramaṇas*. The *Mahānidāśa*, which is a Pali Canonical work of the third or second century B.C., contains a list of places with which India had commercial relations by land and water. This list includes the name of Alasanda (Alexandria), Yona and Paramayona. Even if it be contended that the first two were places in India, the third was a Greek territory outside India. The edicts, however, are silent on the routes along which the *dūtas* of Aśoka travelled to the courts and territories of the five Greek 'frontagers'.

As to R. E. XIV :—

1. asti eva saṁkhitena asti majhamena asti vistat(e)na : By this Aśoka, while reviewing the whole set of thirteen Rock Edicts caused to be engraved up till the 13th or 14th year of his *abhisheka*, wanted to divide them into three classes : (1) those written in an abridged form, (2) those in a medium form, and (3) those in an amplified form. The expressions *saṁkhitena* and *vistatena* cannot but remind us of the oft-recurring Pali phrase *saṁkhitena bhāsitassa vitthārena attham*... I cannot agree with Hultzsch in thinking that by the first clause, *asti saṁkhitena*, Aśoka referred to the Minor Rock Edict which is shortest in two versions and longest in four. The clause is not applicable to M. R. E. for the simple reason that it was engraved as an example of *dhammasāvana*, and not as a piece of *dhammalipi*. Among the first thirteen Rock Edicts, to the first category belong the third, seventh, tenth and eleventh ; to the second category, the 1st, 2nd, eighth, and twelfth ; and to the third category, the fourth, fifth, sixth, ninth and thirteenth.

2. asti eta puna-puna-vutaṁ : According to Kauṭilya (*Arthaśāstra*, II. 10), *punarukti* or repetition is one of the faults of a writ (*lekhadoshāḥ*). Aśoka was aware of this drawback in his edicts, and he sought to justify it by *athasa mādhuratā* or sweetness of meaning, what Kauṭilya calls *mādhurya*. In Buddhaghosa's opinion, a statement is delighting because of the sweetness of its meaning (*atthamadhuratāya pemaṇiyā*). With Kauṭilya a statement in exquisite style of a good purport with pleasing effect is sweetness (*sukhopanita-chārvartha-sabdābhidhānam mādhuryam*).

3. tatra ekadā asamātāṁ likhitāṁ : According to Aśoka, *asamāti* (sk. *asamāpti*), corresponding to Kauṭilya's *aparipūrṇatā* (incompleteness), was the main drawback of his Rock Edicts. He attributes it to one of these three causes : (1) consideration of the place (*desaṁ sachhāya*), (2) some special reason (*kāraṇam ālochetpā*), and (3) fault of the scribe (*lipikarāparādhena*). This



drawback concerns also such edicts as Separate Rock, Minor Rock, Pillar and Schism Pillar. As regards the Rock Edicts, the main case of incompleteness to be noticed is the omission of three edicts, viz., xi, xii, and xiii, at Dhauḷi and Jaugaḍā. But there was evidently no earthly reason for the omission of R. E. XI and R. E. XII except that they were in a bad company. Their misfortune was that they were despatched along with R. E. XIII, which contained a reference to the conquest of Kaliṅga. The engraving of R. E. XIII at Dhauḷi and Jaugaḍā, which is to say, in the province of Kaliṅga, would, therefore, be impolitic. The official despatcher or the local editor ought to have made discrimination. The unsuitability of the place was a sufficient reason for the omission of R. E. XIII at Dhauḷi and Jaugaḍā. What special reason other than hurting the feelings of the people of Kaliṅga there might be, it is difficult to divine. But even that special reason was implied in the unsuitability of the place.

In the case of R. E. IX, the versions fall at once into two groups, G, Dh and J into one and Ye, K, Sh and M into the other. The two part company after the clause *āva tasa athasa nistānāya*. The sequel in one differs entirely from the sequel in the other. Thus each involves a case of omission in the other. The first two grounds of Aśoka do not apply to this case. For the discrepancy between the two, the *lipikara* or scribe at the place of origin of the draft must be held responsible. The non-engraving of P. E. VII on all pillars but the DT affords another instance of omission, for which either the official despatcher of drafts or the local agent was responsible, and not necessarily the *lipikara* of the place where the pillar was situated. The local editor may be held responsible for the omission of the additional matter in the Sārnāth copy of the Schism Pillar Edict at Kauśāmbī and Sāñchī, the omission of certain words in the Jaugaḍā version of S. R. E. I, the omission of the instructions about the engraving of the matter of proclamation (Ru and Sa) in other copies of M. R. E., and for variations in the size of different versions of M. R. E. The *lipikara* who did the engraving work on rocks and pillars was responsible, no doubt, for the dropping of certain syllables and expressions in the body of P. E. VII, S. R. E. I (Dh and J), as also for mis-spellings, some of them giving rise to grammatical inaccuracies.

As to S. R. E. I :—

1. baṁdhanāntika : By this Aśoka means the ultimate end of the process of arrest and torture. Hultzsch takes it to mean "an order cancelling the imprisonment," which is far from the case. There is no reason why owing to such an order as this the near and distant relations of the man should feel grieved. Bhandarkar treats *baṁdhanāntikaṁ* as a compound of two words, *baṁdhanam* meaning 'imprisonment' and *antikaṁ* meaning 'death', while



Mookerji interprets it in the sense of 'death'. Even there is a suggestion to the effect that here the word means the cutting asunder of the wordly tie, i.e., renunciation, and Dr. N. Dutt endorses it. As against Bhandarkar's interpretation, it may be pointed out that the word *am̐tika* alone does nowhere mean 'death'. In the Pali idiom *ābādham mārānantikam*, the second word means 'that which ends in death'. Accordingly the word *bandhanam̐tika* must be explained as meaning 'that which leads up to' 'that which terminates in imprisonment', the *kārābandhana* intensifying the trouble and torture attending the mere arrest and detention. One might cite the expression *prāṇāntiko vyādhiḥ* (life-killing disease, disease ending life) from the Vāsisht̐ha Dharmaśāstra, xx. 10, to defend Hultzsch's interpretation of *bandhanam̐tika*. But Aśoka's solicitude expressed in the words : *akasmā palibodhe akasmā palikilese va no siyā* establishes beyond doubt that he thought of nothing but *bandhana* and *palikilesa* culminating in imprisonment.

2. *majham paṭipādayema* : "We shall fulfil the mean". Here the word *majha*, Pali *majjha*, Sk. *madhya*, is used as a substantive or an adverb, cp. Pali *majjhena dhammam desemi*. In Pali, the position of *majjha* is contrasted with two extremes (*due antā*). In the edict, too, *majha* implies a 'mean' or 'middle course' between two extreme courses of action, one hasty, precipitated, and the other slow, lethargic. Behind hasty action are such immoral mental dispositions as *isā* (malignity), *āsulopa* (irascibility), *niṭṭhūliyam* (cruelty), and *tūlanā* (oppressiveness). And behind slow action are such bad mental habits as *anāvuti* (non-application), *ālasiam* (indolence), and *kilamatha* (weariness for exertion). The best commentary on Aśoka's dictum is offered by Kauṭilya (Arthaśāstra, I. 4) when he argues and opines : "Whosoever imposes severe punishment (*tikshṇadaṇḍa*) becomes repulsive to the people ; while he who awards mild punishment (*mṛidudaṇḍa*) becomes contemptible. But whoever imposes punishment as deserved becomes respectable. For punishment (*daṇḍa*), when awarded with due consideration, makes the people devoted to righteousness and to works productive of wealth and enjoyment, while punishment, when ill-awarded under the influence of greed and anger or owing to ignorance, excites fury even among hermits and ascetics dwelling in forests, not to speak of householders." The earlier opinion of Law and Polity (cf. Manu) favoured *udyata daṇḍa* or *tikshṇa daṇḍa*. The pursuit of the middle course proposed by Aśoka had certainly behind it the Buddha's Doctrine of the Middle Path.

3. *duāhale etasa kammasa same* (J), *duāhale imasa kammasa me* (Dh) :

All the Aśokan scholars, with the single exception of Mr. S. N. Mitra, agree in interpreting *duāhale* in the sense of 'having a twofold consequence', 'having a twofold gain'. But this is not permitted by the grammatical construction of the sentence. We cannot say *duāhale etasa kammasa*, for the word *same*, as



in J, in needed to match with the adjective *duāhale*, in which case the word *duāhale* is formed of *du* and *āhale* without any *sandhi* between them. The attainment of heaven (*svagasa āladhi*) and the attainment of the king's favour (*lājāladhi*) are indeed held out as the twofold reward of the course of action suggested by Aśoka in the context. But the statement with which we are concerned stands apart from that which precedes and that which follows it.

4. *Tisa-nakhatena* (Dh), *anu-Tisaṃ* (J) : This is just another way of saying *anuchātummāsaṃ Tisena nakhatena* (S. R. E. II, Dh), which Bhandarkar correctly translates by "on the Tishya day every four-monthly season." Mookerji's rendering—"at the commencement of every quarter of the year on the Tishya day"—is not acceptable because we cannot think of the Tishya day at the commencement of every quarter of the year. According to S. R. E. I (J), all that Aśoka meant was *am-Tisaṃ* or on every Tishya day, under every Tishya asterism during the four-monthly season and throughout the year.

The question arises—why is so much importance attached to the Tishya asterism,—the Tishya day? Presumably no such importance would have been attached, if it had not 'a special significance in the life of Aśoka. The only rival of Tishya among the *nakshatras* is Punarvasu. But in P. E. V, where both Tishya and Punarvasu find mention side by side, invariably the former enjoys precedence over the latter,—*Tisāye Punāvasune*, while in the present edict and in S. R. E. II, Tishya alone receives the all-engrossing attention. This leads Bhandarkar to suggest that Tishya was probably the birth-star of Aśoka, while accepting Bühler's explanation for the sacredness of certain days in the month of Taisha or Pausha, Mookerji inclines to claim Punarvasu as Aśoka's birth-star. Mookerji's inference about the relation of Punarvasu to Aśoka's life is untenable as it is drawn from wrong premises. For further discussion of the point the reader is referred to the note under P. E. V. Here we are concerned with the Tishya asterism which may occur in each season, nay, in each month, when the moon enters into the constellation of *Karkaṭa* or Cancer.

#### As to S. R. E. II :—

1. *mahāmātā lājavachanikā* : Same as *Lājavachanikā* in S. R. E. I (J). Bhandarkar (Aśoka, p. 386) suggests : "If *Nagala-viyohālakā* represents the Judicial, *Lājavachanikā* had better be taken to represent the Executive, Officers of a District town." I cannot endorse this opinion for the reason that the *Lājavachanikas* with their headquarters at Samāpā, for example, were responsible for the whole administration of the Division within the province of Gandhāra



under the Viceroy-in-Council, while the jurisdiction of the City-judiciaries was confined to a city or town.

2. sava-munisā me pajā : Same as *sava-muniṣe pajā mamā* in S. R. E. I (Dh). From this dictum, that all his subjects were unto him like his progeny, it is not to be inferred that Aśoka's was either a paternal or maternal, either a patriarchal or matriarchal type of government. The ideal personal relationship in feeling between the ruler and the ruled was that between a solicitious father and devoted children capable of appreciating the king's solicitude for them : *athā pitā hevaṃ ne lājā...apheni anukāṃpati, athā pajā hevaṃ maye lājine*. The Mahāsutasoma Jātaka compares the position to that of a father or mother (*yathā pitā athavāpi mātā*). The same is the case with the Mahābhārata, Śāntiparva, Rājadharmaparva, 68. 29 and 56. 44, 46, while the Arthasāstra enjoins : "the king shall favour like a father those who have passed the period for remission of taxes", "the king shall always protect the afflicted among his people as a father his sons" (Mookerji, Asoka, p. 121). Even one may cite the verses from the Jātakas to show that all manner of domestic relationship were brought in by way of an analogy of the ideal relationship between a king and his subjects. But all these were far from determining the type of government, since these were intended to express the king's mental feelings and their reciprocation in appreciation by the subjects. The character of government must be judged on other facts than these.

#### As to M. R. E. :—

1. Suvarṇagiriṭe : "From Suvarṇagiri." Suvarṇagiri was evidently the official headquarters of the Āryaputra-in-Council. The location of the city deriving its name from the mountain called Suvarṇagiri is still a matter of speculation. Mookerji (Asoka, p. 197) observes : "From its name, the 'gold mount', the place might be in the ancient gold-mining areas, and this edict has been found at Maski near Raichur, which shows numerous traces of ancient gold workings, a shaft of which is the deepest in the world known so far (Hyderabad Arch. Series, No. I). Hultzsch identifies it with Kanakagiri, south of Maski." This is not convincing. The place to be identified with Suvarṇagiri must be a place with a mountain near by, which bears a copy of M. R. E. similar to that found at Siddāpura, Brahmagiri and Jaṭiṅga-Rāmeswara. Even we should expect, to find there a set of the Fourteen Rock Edicts. So far the village of Yerraguḍi satisfies this criterion, to a large extent. But we must patiently wait for the discovery of yet another set of Rock Edicts along with another copy of M. R. E. similar to Si, Bra and Ja farther south within Mysore.



2. Isila : The proximity of the three copies of M. R. E., almost identical in their language and contents and engraved by one and the same scribe who signs his name as Chapaḍa, has made it easy to locate Isila, which was the headquarters of the *Mahāmātras* placed in charge of the administration of a Division in the Southern Province under the Āryaputra-in-Council. It is generally identified with Siddāpura in the Chittaldrug District of Mysore. The site of the city must have been situated in the neighbourhood of the three rocks bearing the three copies of M. R. E. The name of Isila is met with in one of the Sānchī Stūpa Inscriptions.

3. adhikāni adhātīyāni vasāni : "While for more than two and half years." Here *adhikāni* is the same expression as *sādhikāni*, *sātirekāni*. The whole expression means "for more than two-and-half but less than three years." The Siddāpura, Brahmagirī and Jaṭiṅga-Rāmesvara versions of M. R. E. leave no room for doubt that here Aśoka gives an account of two stages of *upāsakatva*, one of less vigours and the other of more vigours action. The statement is definite on the point of Aśoka's position as *upāsaka* or lay worshipper. His statements in the remaining versions are somewhat misleading as these may be taken to give an account of four years, of two-and-half years and more while he remained a *upāsaka* and of one year or more when he became somehow or other intimately connected with the Saṅgha (*saṅgham upagata*).

4. saṅgham upagate : Same as to say *saṅghe upayāte*, *upete*, *upayāte*. By this Aśoka distinguished the second stage in his position as *upāsaka*, the stage wherefrom emerged vigorous action. This stage was gone through, as he expressly tells us, during the short period of time exceeding one year. The earlier stage which was characterised by less vigorous action was gone through in one year, according to the three Mysore copies of M. R. E., and in more than two-and-half years, according to the remaining versions. The Mysore copies restrict the position of Aśoka to *upāsakatva*, while the remaining texts place no bar to construing *saṅgham-upagatatva* as a position apart from *upāsakatva*. The opinion of Aśokan scholars is sharply divided on this very point. In the opinion of Bühler and Kern, Aśoka became for the time being a monk, ceasing to be the monarch, the monastic vows being incompatible with kingly duties. Vincent A. Smith holds that Aśoka actually assumed monastic vows without ceasing to be the monarch, the monk and monarch being not incompatible, and cites in his support the evidence of I-tsing who saw a statue of Aśoka as monk, and cites also the examples of the Jaina king Kumārapāla and two Buddhist kings, one of Burma and one of Tibet.

Senart, on the other hand, thinks that *saṅgham upagamanam* 'refers to the state visit of the king to the Saṅgha, in the midst of which he took his seat



and made a public profession of his Buddhist faith, as the Sinhalese Chronicle *Mahāvamsā* informs us' (I. A., 1891, p. 233 f.). Against this opinion of the French *savant*, as also against the opinion of Mookerji and of myself, Bhandarkar (*Aśoka*, p. 82) contends that the *saṅgham-upagata* of Aśoka having lasted the whole period of his second stage, one cannot say 'that the king visited the Saṅgha for over a year (which is nonsensical), but rather *lived* with it for that period,'—lived not as monk but as *upāsaka*. In doing so, Bhandarkar (*Aśoka*, p. 371) just upholds the view of Hultsch according to whom, "the period of two years and a half does not precede but includes the period of one year and more that the king was with the Saṅgha."

But as pointed out above, in M. R. E., Aśoka sought to give an account of what had happened either during the period of three years or during the period of four years. The Pali legend of Aśoka, too, offers us an account of just a period of four years, during the first three of which he remained attached to the representatives of other religious orders and during the fourth he came into contact with the members of the Saṅgha or Buddhist Order, and became a staunch lay supporter of the Buddhist faith. The four years are, however, counted from the date of his *abhisheka*, while the edict under notice keeps us altogether in the dark as to the date from which the period of three or four years commenced. It is from R. E. XIII that we learn that the true religious turn of mind of Aśoka came to prevail from the time of the conquest of Kalinga in the eighth year of his *abhisheka*. The period of three years from the eighth year included the tenth year in which Aśoka proceeded to Sambodhi, and between the eighth and the twelfth year of *Abhisheka*, we may easily conceive a period of four years, the twelfth year being the year from which he began to promulgate his *Dhammalipis* (P. E. VI). The correspondence between the Pali legend and the M. R. E. is not to be established in the way in which I did it before. According to the former, during the first three years Aśoka remained a lay adherent of other sects, and it was in the fourth year that he came into contact with the Buddhist Saṅgha and became a believer in Buddha's Doctrine (*Buddha-sāsane pasīdi*). Now I find that Aśoka tells us almost the same story in his M. R. E. By the term *upāsaka*, as employed in this edict we need not understand a lay worshipper of the Buddha. Even among the Jainas, the lay supporters of their religious order were called *uvāsagas* (*upāsakas*). Same holds true of the lay supporters of the Ājīvika and other ascetic orders. The lay supporters of the Buddhist Order, too, were distinguished from the ordained members, the monks and nuns, as *upāsakas* and *upāsikās* (Bhābru Edict). All that he wanted to say is that while he remained a lay adherent of ascetic orders other than Buddhist, his religious activity was less vigorous, and it had not become more vigorous until he came in contact with the Buddhist Saṅgha, until he accepted the guidance of this order in matters religious. In other words, his *saṅgham upagatē* is to all intents and purposes the same expression as the Pali *saṅgham saraṇam gato, saṅgham saraṇattham*



*upeto, saṃghassa sissabhāvaṃ upagato*, all met with in Buddhaghosa's *Sumaṅgala-vilāsinī*, I, pp. 230-6. Mookerji has misquoted *gantvā saṃghaṃ* as an idiom sanctioned by the *Mahāvamsa*, V. 76, while, in point of fact, the connexion of *saṃghaṃ* is with the verb *nimantiya* following it: *gantvā saṃghaṃ nimantiya*.

Buddhaghosa in his *Samanta-pāsādikā*, I, *Bāhira-nidāna*, tells us that Aśoka's father Bindusāra was a votary of the Brahmins (*Brāhmaṇabhatto*) and daily fed the Brahmans, Brahmanical sects, the ash-bodied ascetics, and the like, 60,000 in number since his coronation, Aśoka, too, began to feed them daily in his household exactly in the manner of his father. But their unrestrained demeanour, uncouth habits, ugly manners, etc. greatly disappointed him and rudely shocked his sense of decency. So he thought of finding out deserving people and turned to his courtiers who made recommendations, each according to his religious predilection. The sects recommended were the ash-bodied wandering ascetics, Ājīvakas, Nirgranthas, and the like (*Paṇḍaraṅgaparibbājakājīvaka-Niggaṇṭhādayo*). Detecting hollowness in all of them, he bade them adieu after properly feeding them once as they were brought in from time to time. While time was thus passing, accidentally one day he chanced to see a young representative of the Buddhist Saṅgha, whose subdued manners and calm demeanour deeply impressed him. The principle of *apramāda* as constituting the essence of the religion of the Buddha made a lasting appeal to his heart. It was through the instrumentality of this young representative that subsequently the senior members of the Fraternity came in to replace the earlier recipients of the king's bounty among other religionists. The first admiration kindled gradually deepened into firm faith (*achalappasāda*), and the king became a confirmed believer in the Buddha's religion, and forthwith caused a large monastery, named Asokārāma after him, to be erected at the capital and thereafter undertook to erect at the instance of the Bhikshus eighty-four thousand *vihāras* in honour of the eighty-four thousand sections of the formulated doctrine of the Buddha and his immediate Disciples, one in each of the eighty-four thousand towns, all over Jambudvīpa. The work of construction of the monasteries was completed in three years (*tīhi saṃvachchharehi vihārakammaṃ nittlāpesi*).

Aśoka's religious turn of mind became manifest in the eighth year of his *abhisheka*, soon after the conquest of Kalinga (R. E. XIII). In the 10th year he proceeded on a pilgrimage to Sambodhi (R. E. VIII). The interval between the two, namely, the conquest of Kalinga and pilgrimage to Bodhgayā is less than three years. And the interval between this pilgrimage and the first promulgation of the *dhammalipis* in the twelfth year of *abhisheka* (P. E. VI) may be conceived as over one year, the pilgrimage being taken to mark the commencement of his Buddhist faith under the guidance of the Saṅgha. But in the same twelfth year he dedicated two cave-dwellings to the Ājīvikas, which unmistakably proves his previous contact with them.



'The transference of allegiance of faith from other bodies to the Buddhist Order, which is now offered as a correct interpretation of *Samgham-upagamanam* alters the entire situation. 'Living with the Saṅgha' without taking monastic vows, as suggested by Hultsch and held by Bhandarkar, is inconceivable. The Divyāvadāna tells us indeed that on virtual abdication of the throne by Aśoka in the closing part of his reign, he betook himself to Kukkuṭārāma where he resided until his unhappy end. But this lacks corroboration from his edicts, in which he appears in the full splendour of his sovereignty. The taking of monastic vows by Aśoka is out of the question. In the Bhābru Edict, he has addressed the Saṅgha in his capacity as the Māgadhan king (*lājā Māgadhe*) and, for the matter of that, as *upāsaka*. When he promulgated an ordinance for the suppression of schism in the Saṅgha, he did so also as king (Schism Pillar Edict). The same was his worldly position also when he undertook his pilgrimage to *Sambodhi* in the 10th year of his *abhisheka* (R. E. VIII), and to *Lumbinī* in the 20th year (Lumbinī Pillar Inscription). The suggestion, that Aśoka became not a *bhikkhu* but merely a *bhikkhugatika*, made by Mr. Charan Dās Chatterji, is untenable on the same ground. Mr. S. N. Mitra cites the instance of king Milinda from the *Milindapañha*, p. 90 f., to show that Aśoka might even be a *gahaṭṭha-muni* or self-ordained *religieux*, putting on yellow garment, withdrawing himself for the time being from the kingly duties, controlling his senses and keeping his nature subdued. The case of Aśoka is, however, different; his expression *saṅgham upagate* cannot but suggest his personal contact with the Saṅgha.

As for the correspondence sought to be established between Aśoka's statements in M. R. E. and the facts embodied in the Buddhist legends on the assumption that Aśoka meant to distinguish between the two stages of his life as *upāsaka* or lay worshipper of the Buddha, the reader may be referred to my *Aśoka Edicts in New Light*, p. 89 f., and better to Mookerji's *Asoka*, p. 109.

5. *iminā kālena* : Same as to *say etena aṃtalena* (Sa), *imāyaṃ velāyaṃ* (Ga), *pure* (Ma); literally, "by this time". The expression is generally taken to refer to the period of three or four years mentioned in the edict. Not necessarily. The *Sahasrām* variant, *etena aṃtalena*, suggests, "heretofore", and the *Māski* variant, *pure*, "formerly". In Ye, *iminā kālena*, in Ga, *imāyaṃ velāyaṃ*, and in Ma, *pure* is contrasted with *dāni* (= *idāni*), meaning "now". Here the expression, *dāni* "now", refers to the date of the proclamation (*dhamma-sāvana*) embodied in M. R. E. which may not be identical with the closing date of the period mentioned in the edict. Much stress is laid by Bhandarkar on the occurrence of the present indicative form, *sumi*, of the root  $\sqrt{as}$  (to be) in the statement, *aṃ upāsaka sumi* (Sa), *ya sumi sagha-upete* (Ru), but from the context, it is clear that *sumi* is just an instance of historical present. In other words, a past event is narrated in the proclamation of which the date is still



to be determined. Compare Cariyā Piṭaka, III. 8. 1 : *Punāparam yadā homi tūpaso Sachcha-savhayo.*

6. *amisā samānā mūnisā Jambudīpasi misā (misibhūtā) devchi* : Literally, "Men who (formerly) were mixed (commingled) with the gods." On the strength of the Māskī variant *misibhūtā*, Pali *missibhūtā*, Sk. *miśrībhūtā*, Sylvan Lévi was able to expose the utter untenability of Haraprasad Śāstri's equation of *amisā* with *amṛishā* and of *misā* with *mṛishā*, meaning 'false', 'falsified'. With this has vanished for good his misinterpretation of Aśoka's intention. According to Śāstri, by the above statement Aśoka claims to have falsified the gods, i.e., the Brahmins who passed theretofore as true gods.

In the opinion of Dr. F. W. Thomas (Cambridge History, I. p. 505), "Aśoka claims that in little more than a year he had brought the Brāhman gods to the knowledge of those people in India, i.e., the wild tribes, who had formerly known nothing of them." Mookerji (Asoka, p. 111) suggests by way of a further and more probable interpretation : "(1) Within this interval, in Jambudvīpa, men who were 'unmingled with gods', (i.e., had no gods or no religion) came to be mingled with gods' (i.e., became religious, or worshippers of gods).

By Asoka's missionary activities following a closer contact with the Saṅgha, the cause of religion had made a considerable advance among the peoples of India.

(2) Within this interval, in Jambudvīpa, men whose gods were disunited had become men whose gods were united.

In other words, within this interval of time, the strife of gods and their worshippers (i.e., of the jarring sects) had largely ceased in the country."

Following a plain and natural interpretation of the statement, Bhandarkar (Aśoka, p. 140) suggests : "In this edict Aśoka has described the result of his missionary work in a twofold manner, first, by saying that he has made gods and men one another's associates and next by saying that there was attainment of heavenly felicity. The commingling of men and gods must therefore be so explained as to show that it was tantamount to the achievement of heaven. This is possible only if we say that by following Aśoka's Dhamma men became so virtuous that they attained to heaven and were associated with gods. . . . the Dharmasūtra of Āpastamba has the following : 'Formerly men and gods lived together in this world. Then the gods through *karman* went to heaven : men were left behind. Whosoever perform the *karman* of those (gods) in the same manner dwell (after death), with the gods and Brahmā in the other world.' From this it is clear that what Aśoka means is that he led men in the path of Dhamma and induced them to perform virtuous courses to such an extent that they became fit to be commingled with gods, not simply in the next but rather in this world."

The interpretation of Thomas falls far wide of the mark. That of Mookerji is full of speculations. That of Bhandarkar keeps us close to the text.



Mookerji's speculations are occasioned by variations in texts. The texts, however, fall into three groups: (1) the group in which men who were unmingled with gods are said to have been commingled with gods; (2) the group in which gods who were unmingled with men are said to have been commingled with men; and (3) the group (Ru, Ma) in which the gods who were unmingled are said to have been commingled (*ye amisā devā husu te dāni misibhūtā*). But one text clarifies the meaning of the other and helps us to complete the other, if some word is wanting in it. As regards the third group, for instance, the word *mānusehi* is wanting, it is supplied in Ga which reads: *amisā devā samāṇā mānusehi se dāni misā kaṭā*, while Ru reads *amisā devā husu te dāni misā kaṭā*. Sa synthesises all the variations when it reads *am̐misam-devā sam̐ta munisā misam-deva kaṭā*. The two rules of Pāṇini and literary parallels cited (*ante*, p. 103) are enough to establish that *mānusehi* and *devehi* mean in the context 'with men', 'with gods'.

As the saying is in the Harivamśa (*ante*, p. 103), there was at that time association (lit., "living together") of gods and men (*devatānām manushyānām sahaṁśo 'bhavat tadā*). To the same effect said Āpastamba: "Saha deva-manushyāḥ asmiṇ-lloke purā babhūvuh. Atha devā karmabhir divam jagmur ahiyanta manushyāḥ. Teshām ye tathā karmāṇy-ārabhante saha devair brahmaṇā chāmushmiṇ-lloke bhavanti." His *devas* are no other than *Pitavas* and happy souls in the world of gods and Brahmā.

Aśoka's statement of the fact is different, inasmuch as he says that "formerly gods and men were unmingled in Jambudvīpa, and now they have been commingled." It is not clear, however, from this statement alone whether he spoke of the commingling of gods and men on this earth or of that in heaven after death. The statement in the sequel, that even the lesser man, if he exerts himself, is able to attain grand heaven (*khudakena pi pakaminena vipule svage sakye āradhetave*), cannot but lead us to think that he spoke of the commingling rather in heaven than on earth. And yet Bhandarkar would seem justified when he suggests that Aśoka's intention was to make men fit "to be commingled with gods, not simply in the next but rather in this world."

The common point between the two views is that *karman* or appropriate action is the means of bringing about the happy association or commingling. Aśoka's *pakama* or *parākrama* is just a vigorous form of Āpastamba's *karman*.

R. E. X throws abundant light on the point at issue. In it, Aśoka says that what little he exerted himself, all that was for the hereafter and in order that all might be freed from the innate proneness to immorality (*yam tu kichi parikamate tam savam pāvatrikāya kintī sakale apaparivrave asa*). Thus here, too, the main interest is otherworldly and the means is *parākrama*. The exertion to be made must be of the very best kind (*agena parākramena*), and it has



to be made by leaving everything else (*savam parichajitpā*). This exertion is to be directed to making all sinless, for without sinlessness one cannot better one's lot hereafter. By implication then sinlessness is godliness on earth and it alone entitles a person to a godly state hereafter, in heaven. In R. E. IX, Aśoka exclaims— can there be any greater duty than the attainment of heaven (*ki cha iminā katavyataram yathā svagāradhi*)? The *svarga* or heaven is the grand world of unbounded merit (*anamātam puṇnam*) and of felicity.

Even so, I cannot deny the weight of Bhandarkar's observation. Although the attainment of heaven or fulfilment of the otherworldly interest as desired object (*aṭhe*) far outweighed all other considerations, the furtherance of this-worldly interest, too, had its due place as part achievement of the desired object. So in R. E. IV, Aśoka declares : "What little I exert myself, it is intended that I shall acquit myself of the debt to the living beings and that I shall make them happy here and enable them to attain heaven hereafter" (*yā kiṁchī parākramāmi aham kiṁti bhūtānam ānamnam gachheyam idha cha nāni sukhāpayāmi paratrā cha svagam āradhayāntu*). Here we see that Aśoka's *parākrama* was directed also to increasing happiness or felicity of all beings on earth,—in this world. And in R. E. XI, he claims that by means of the gift of piety this world is secured and unbounded merit is produced hereafter (*ialoke cha aradheti paratra cha anataṁ puṇa prasavati tena dhammadānena*).

The commingling of gods and men or of men and gods in heaven hereafter is easily understandable. But what did Aśoka mean, if he really claimed to have commingled them on earth,—in Jambudvīpa? To satisfactorily answer this relevant question, the guidance should, in the first instance, be sought from the contemporary Buddhist literature in which the appellation of *deva* or 'god' is applied to the gods by birth (*upapatti-devā*), the gods by courtesy (*sammuti-devā*, kings, princes, etc.), and the gods by purity (*visuddhi-devā*, saintly personages, the elect among the *śramaṇas* and *Brāhmaṇas*). As for the gods by birth, they were, according to the definition implied in R. E. IV, those heavenly beings who were endowed with divine forms (*divyāni rūpāṇi*) and entitled to having *vimānas* or moving mansions as their abodes, celestial elephants as their vehicles, and the heavenly luminaries as their visible manifestations. In other words, the grand heaven attainable hereafter was the world of Brahmā, Indra, Lokapālas, and others. The gods by courtesy were the king, viceroys, and other princes of the blood ; strictly speaking, they were all beloved of the gods (*devānampiyā, devānuppiyā*). And the gods by purity were the *śramaṇas* and *Brāhmaṇas* or the *Brāhmaṇas* and *śramaṇas*, in whom the people of India reposed their sincere faith (*pasāda*, R. E. XIII), strictly speaking, the well-controlled ones among them (*yesam suvihitānam*, R. E. XIII). Here one may compare Kauṭilya's saying (*Arthaśāstra*, XII. 3) : *ye devā devalokeshu, mānuśeshu cha brāhmaṇāḥ*. The gods by courtesy and those by purity belong to Jambudvīpa, which is to say, to this earth. If the rest are termed men (*munisā*)



belonging to Jambudvīpa, what could Aśoka possibly mean by the commingling of men with the gods on earth?

We find that Aśoka proposed a common scheme of Dhamma for all alike, princes and commoners, ascetics and householders, officials and non-officials, and commended the self-same seven Buddhist texts alike to the monks, nuns and male and female worshippers for their constant study and comprehension (Bhābru). He wanted all of them to co-operate for the furtherance of the common mission which aimed at helping all persons to grow with the growth in piety through conformation to the Law of Piety or Duty and elevating them (P. E. VII). This mission aimed at removing moral depravity from all persons (*sakale apaparīsave asa*, R. E. X), making all happy on earth and entitled to godly existence in heaven hereafter (R. E. VI). He tried to bring together men of all sects of recluses and householders for frank discussions and free exchanges of ideas with a view to the growth in the essence of things (*sāraavadhi*), with a view to finding all sects well-informed and possessed of noble traditions (R. E. XII). The imparting of moral instructions (*dhammānusathini*), the proclamations containing happy messages of dhamma (*dhammasāvanāni*), the institution of permanent works of piety and public utility (*dhammathambhāni*), the appointment of *Dharmamahāmātras*, moral persuasion (*nijhati*), the making and enforcement of various Regulations of Piety (*dhammanīyamāni*), enabling the *Brāhmaṇas* and *Śramaṇas* to freely move and preach and work among all peoples of Jambudvīpa (R. E. V), and the like were the means adopted for the fulfilment of the grand mission.

7. *dāni* : Prakrit equivalent of *idānim*, meaning 'now'. Now, but when?

Here *dāni* is employed in contradistinction to *iminā kālena* (Ye), *imāyaṃ velāyaṃ* (Ga), *imāya kālāya* (Ru), *pure* (Ma), the latter referring indefinitely to the time prior to the period of vigorous action on the part of Aśoka. 'Now' refers to the time of the proclamation contained in M. R. E. The question is—Is this time coincident with the year of Aśoka's contact with the Saṅgha and vigorous action? Taking the two to be coincident with each other, it is suggested that M. R. E. is the earliest of Aśoka's records. Mookerji argues (Aśoka, p. 43): "The Minor Rock Edicts are taken to be prior to the Rock Edicts, as both in the Rupnath and Sahasram versions, there is a reference to the king's order that the Edicts should be incised on rock and pillar, thus presaging both the Rock and Pillar Edicts." The king's order reads: *ima aṭham pavatesu likhāpayātha, yata cā athi silāthambhā tata pi likhāpayātha* (Sa). "Have this matter incised on rocks, or where stone-pillars are available, cause it to be incised even there."

What goes against Mookerji is that we have a similar order at the end of P. E. VII: *iyaṃ dhammalibī ata athi silāthambhāni vā silāphalakāni vā tata kaṭaviyā*, "this Edict of the Law of Piety, where are to be found stone-pillars or



stone-blocks, should be incised there," and in this instance P. E. VII does not presage but presupposes inscriptions on pillars and slabs. So applying his argument, one must rather hold that M. R. E. presupposes both the Rock and Pillar Edicts. And from the actual placing on the rock at Yerragudi of M. R. E. below the Rock Edicts, it appears that it was engraved after the Rock series of Aśoka's inscriptions.

There is yet another important point to consider. In M. R. E., Aśoka records the sum total of the result obtained by his strenuous effort in the shape of commingling of gods and men in Jambudvīpa, while in the Rock Edicts he speaks of the progress he was making towards this end. P. E. VII presupposes indeed his *dhammānusathis* embodied in the Rock Edicts, his *dhammasāvanas* typified by M. R. E., his *dhammathambhas* or monumental acts of piety recorded in R. E. II and Queen's Edict, and his *dhammaniyamas* typified by P. E. V. But if Aśoka continued to reign for a few years after the 27th year of *abhisheka*, it is very probable that proclamations of piety were made also in those years. The decision of the point at issue depends to some extent on the interpretation of the enigmatic expression, *vyuthena* 256.

8. *khudakā cha mahātpā cha* : Lit., "lesser men and greater men" ; *mahātpā* has for its variants *udālā*, *mahalakā* (Ye). Bhandarkar takes the two words to refer to the king's officers. But the king's officers are classified differently into three grades in P. E. I, viz., (1) *ukasā*, (2) *gevaṇṇā*, and (3) *majjhimā*, consistently with the traditional classification into *mukhya* (*śresthā*), *madhyama*, *jaghanya* (Rāmāyaṇa, Ayodhyākāṇḍa, 100. 25-26 ; Mahābhārata, Sabhāparva, 5. 43), *hīna*, *ukkaṭṭha*, *majjhima* (ante, p. 121). Corresponding to the *khudakā* and *mahātpā* of M. R. E., we have *khudaka* and *usaṭa* in R. E. X. In the Raṭṭhapāla Sutta (Majjhima-N., II, p. 15), *ussaṭa* is employed as a distinctive appellation of the higher grades of officers. But in the context of R. E. X, the distinctive appellations are employed with reference to all (*sakale*), all including officials and non-officials. The message of the *dhamma-sāvana* contained in M. R. E. was to be proclaimed to all, the *jānapadas* and *Rāṭhikas*, and even to the *Antas* (vide Ye), and all were exhorted alike to attain the grand heaven (*svakaṃ sagaṃ vipulaṃ ārādhetaṇṇiya*, Ja), and all, officials, teachers and pupils, were required to co-operate in broadcasting the message (Ye). Similarly in R. E. IX and XI, father, brother, master (or husband), friends, comrades, associates, kinsfolk, and even neighbours were called upon to inculcate the Law of Piety or Duty. From these, it may be concluded that although primarily the appellations apply to the king's officers, by implication, these apply to all persons interested.

9. *ārādhetaṇṇiya, ārādhayitaṇṇiya* : Apparently this is a causative form of the root  $\sqrt{ā-rādh}$ , and Bhandarkar treats it so. Accordingly the king's officers were



required to exert themselves to enable the people to attain the grand heaven (*vīpule svage ārādhetaṇe*). But Aśoka's intention, as expressed in other edicts, is not only that they should enable others to attain but that they themselves should strive to attain. So in S. R. E. I, Aśoka says, addressing the city-judiciaries of Tosali and Samāpā, "Imperfectly given effect indeed to this, there is neither the attainment of heaven nor that of the king's favour" (*nathī svagasa āladhi no lājāladhi*). The same edict contains the exhortation to them in these words: *svagam ālādhayisatha*, "attain heaven". Further in R. E. VI and with reference to all beings (*bhūtānam*), it is said: *paratrā svagam ārādhayaṃtu*, "let them achieve heaven hereafter". Here *ārādhayaṃtu* cannot be construed as a causative form. Similarly in R. E. IX, all persons were to be assured by their fathers, or brothers, or others: *imena sakiye svage ālādhayitave*, "by this you are able to attain heaven."

10. *vyuthena 200 50 6*: Variants of *vyuthena* are *vyūthena* (Bra), *vivuthena* (Sa), *vyūthenā* (Ru), all in connection with the clause *sāvane sāvāpite, sāvane sāvite, sāvane kaṭe*. The expression *vivuthena 256* is explained as meaning *duve-sapaṃnā-satā vivuthā ti* (Sa), and *vyūthenā 200 50 6* as *200 50 6 sata vivāsā* (Ru). Obviously *vivuthā* is a past participle of  $\sqrt{vi}$  *vas*, and *vivāsā* is a past participle of  $\sqrt{vi}$  *vās*. Phonetically *vyūtha* is the Prakrit equivalent of the Sk. *vyushṭa*. The Vedic use of *vyushṭa* in the sense of the fourth *yāma* or dawning period of night need not worry us. In the Arthaśāstra, *vyushṭa* occurs as a technical term and it means "the date stated in terms of the regnal year, month, fortnight and day" (*rājavarshaṃ māsaḥ pakṣaḥ divasaś cha vyushṭam*). And *vivuthā* or *vivāsā* may be taken to mean "have passed" or "are sent, despatched". With the abandonment of the reading *duve-sapaṃnā lātisatā vivuthā*, just three interpretations of *vyuthena 256* remain: (1) by date 256 (Barua, 1926), (2) by 256 missionaries (V. A. Smith), of officers dispatched (Mookerji) (3) by despatch of 256 copies (Mookerji, 1927; Barua, 1941). The second and third interpretations are substantially one and the same. Thus three may at once be reduced to two, and we have to choose between them. If the first interpretation be accepted, the figure 256 must be taken to mean 256 years in terms of a current era, the Buddhist era, in which case M. R. E. must be treated not as the earliest but as the latest record of Aśoka. But the interpretation is doubtful because in all other inscriptions the date is stated in terms of a year of Aśoka's *abhisheka*.

In support of the second interpretation, Mookerji (Asoka, p. 114) observes: "In fact, these inscriptions tell of all the methods by which Asoka sought to give publicity to his proclamations. He would first have them inscribed (*lekḥā-petavālata*) on rock (*pavatisu*) and pillar (*silāṭṭhaṃbhasi*), fixed and permanent; he would also have them circulated in different local areas by despatching his Publicity Officers or copies of his proclamations." My idea of the method is somewhat different. As I make out, 256 copies were despatched to various



centres, from which other copies were to be made for circulation in different local areas within the jurisdiction of the officers concerned, *i.e.*, the *Rajjukas* whose business it was to circulate the king's happy message among people and the *Rāṭhikas*, and the local agents employed were the *kāraṇikas*, the elephant riders, chariot-trainers, Brahmins, and their pupils (Ye). The Rūpnāth text contains the king's direction to the effect that the officers concerned should send out copies everywhere in their jurisdiction (*yāvataka tupaka ahāle savara vivaset-avāya*). Thus a kind of relay method was followed. In the case of the Sārnāth copy of the Schism Pillar Edict, we find that one copy was carefully placed on the main road within an easy reach of the officers concerned. One copy was required to be placed within the reach of the *upāsakas* when they congregated at a monastery on the eighth day of a lunar half month. Other copies were to be made for circulation throughout their jurisdiction and fortified areas. Thus here, too, the direction is : *āvate cha tuphākaṁ āhāle savata vivāsayātha tuphe elina viyājanena*.

As against 256 as a date in terms of the year of a current era, the Buddha era, we may point out, that to accept it so is to treat the edict as the latest record of Aśoka. But the edict which offers a solitary example of recorded *dhamma-sāvana* is clearly presupposed by P. E. VII, engraved in the 27th regnal year in the statement : *dhamma-sāvane kaṭe*. All the earlier edicts except R. E. VI are silent as regards the *dhamma-sāvana*, although several of them were caused to be proclaimed prior to the date of P. E. VII (*dhamma-sāvanāni sāvā-pitāni*). According to P. E. VII, the *dhamma-sāvana* and the *dhammānusathī* were the two cognate methods adopted *pari passu* by Aśoka towards promoting the cause of piety. R. E. IV records the unprecedented result obtained by means of *dhammānusathī*. As regards the subject of *parākrama*, R. E. VI and R. E. X have much in common between them, on the one hand, and the *dhamma-sāvana* in M. R. E., on the other, the only difference being that the Rock Edicts set out the aims and objects of Aśoka's strenuous exertion instead of stating as in M. R. E. the grand result obtained. As discussed already, M. R. E., in so far as the order concerning the materials of engraving goes, presupposes both the Rock and Pillar Edicts. And we find that P. E. VI expressly mentions the 12th year of *abhisheka* as the year from which the *dhammalipis* were being caused to be engraved, but it is reticent on the date of engraving of a *dhamma-sāvana*. There are two important facts that suggest the disparity between the actual date of proclamation of the message contained in M. R. E. and the date of its engraving. In the body of M. R. E., Yerraguḍi copy, we find that its message was directly forwarded to the *Rajjukas* for circulation among the *jāna-padas* and *Rāṭhikas*, while the preamble of the same in three Mysore copies shows that the king's message was to be forwarded to the *Mahāmātras* at Isila in the name of the southern Viceroy-in-Council. From the consideration of these facts, we may easily incline to think that M. R. E. was not probably engraved earlier than P. E. VI.



11. *avaradhiyā, aparadhiyā, apaladhiyenā* : “by the least part or minimum” (Mookerji, p. 113), cf. Pāṇini, V. 4. 47 ; *avarārdhāt* ; Sk. *aparārdhya* or *avarārdhya* means “without a maximum”.

12. *kārunakāni* : I prefer to read *kāranakāni*. The *kāranakas* are not to be mistaken for the Pali *kāraṇikas* or judges. In the Mahābhārata, Sabhāparva, 5. 34, the *kāraṇikas* are represented as teachers to the princes and leading warriors:

*kvachchit kāraṇikā dharme sarvasāstresu kovidāḥ :*  
*kārayanti kumārānś cha yodhamukhyāś cha sarvaśaḥ ||*

See also Amarakosha, Viśeshyanighna-varga, 12. This meaning fits in with the Aśoka context.

13. *esā porāṇā pakiti dīghāvuse cha* : “This is the ancient tradition and a thing of long standing”. In the Kaṭhopanishad, the three words, *śāśvata*, *sanātana* and *purāṇa* are employed as synonyms. The same is the case with Pali literature, in which the word *sanantana* is paraphrased by *purāṇa*, and *porāṇa dhamma* or *porāṇiyā pakiti* by *chirakālappavatto sabhāvo*. Showing respect to elders, for instance, is said to have been a ‘good old rule’ (*porāṇo dhammo*). Aśoka insisted on following the traditional method (*yārisā porāṇā pakiti*, Ye), because it was expedient. Buddha, too, emphasized the importance of conforming to the long-established custom, the good old tradition (*yathā paññatte porāṇe dhamme*, Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta, Ch. I). In Aśoka’s phraseology, the *porāṇā pakiti* is that which has held good as standard of human conduct or ideal of duty and evolved through ages. Respectful attention to seniors, tender-regard for life, telling the truth, etc., are the age-old and widely accepted principles of piety among the Indo-Aryans. In the valedictory address in the Taittirīya Upanishad, I. 11. 1-2, the teacher exhorts the pupil, saying : *satyaṁ vada, dharmam chara, mātṛidevo bhava, pitṛidevo bhava, āchāryadevo bhava*, etc. “Speak truth, practise righteousness, honour mother as goddess, father and teacher as gods.”

As to P. E. I :—

1. *bhayena* : Here *bhaya* is that moral quality which goes together with *lajjā*. Corresponding to the Bengali idiom *lajjā-bhay* we have the Pali *hiri-ottappaṁ*. Buddhaghosa rightly points out (Visuddhimagga, Khandha-niddesa) that *hiri* (*hrī*) is just another word for *lajjā* (*lajjā’ etaṁ adhivachanam*), *uttāsa-lakkhaṇam* (*bhāyana-lakkhaṇam*) *ottappaṁ*. The difference between the two lies in the fact that in the first a person cares for his own prestige, own opinion (*attagāravā*), and in the second a person cares for the prestige of others, the opinion of others (*paragāravā*), and the common element between them is that



both impel a person to feel hesitation in doing something unbefitting, improper. This *bhaya* conveys the sense of fear of public opinion.

2. *usāhena*: Asoka's *usāha* corresponds to Pali *ussāha*, Sk. *utsāha*. This *usāha* is just an aspect of *pakama*, *parākarma*, and *uyāma* (R. E. XIII) or *udyama*. *Utsāha* or zeal is the arduous effort to accomplish an impossible task (*asādhya-sādhane 'pi yadvaśena udyamaḥ sa utsāhaḥ*, Amarakosha-Ṭikā).

3. *Anta-mahāmātā*: The designation, 'generally rendered Wardens of the Marches (Bühler), overseers of the frontier provinces like Charlemagne's Markgrafen (Woolner), or *mahāmātras* of the *Āntas* or Borderers (Hultzsch), corresponds to Kauṭilya's *Antapālas* (Arthasāstra, II. 4) and Buddhaghosa's *Pachchantavāsino Mahāmattā* (Atthasālinī, p. 245). Kauṭilya does not, however, specify the duties of *Antapālas*. Only as a general rule he lays down that, like the repairers of fortifications, the *Antapālas* should be officered with many chiefs so that it may not be easy for them to betray the king to his enemy. Thus the *Antapālas* must have been associated with the *Mudrādhyaksha* whose duty it was to grant passes to travellers coming into or going out of the country. The Superintendent of Pasture Lands was to examine the passes issued. The guarding of the marches must have been the main duty of the *Anta-mahāmātras*. According to Buddhaghosa (*ante*, p. 319), they were appointed by the king to search for, hound out, capture, punish, exterminate, and effectively deal with rebel chiefs (*chora-jettḥakā*) disturbing the internal peace of frontier regions. But they must have been agents also for the transmission of the king's happy messages of piety (M. R. E.) and the communication through envoys of the king's frontier or foreign policy (S. R. E. II) to the 'frontagers'. In the present edict they are required to promote the interests of men under their jurisdiction here and hereafter by following this general rule of action: "protection by piety, provision by piety, pleasing by piety, and guarding by piety."

I find it difficult to agree with Mookerji when he suggests that the work of the *Anta-mahāmātras*, as distinguished from that of the *Purushas*, lay outside the empire, and that they 'must have been the *dūtas* of R. E. XIII, who were also sent out to distant and foreign countries for welfare work under Asoka's scheme'.

It is clear from the edict under notice that the *Anta-mahāmātras* were as much agents for good administration, and country's protection and general welfare as the *Purushas* or general body of officers working in the interior part of the empire. The only difference suggested is that the former were concerned with frontiers, including the no man's land. There is no suggestion as to their being sent out as *dūtas* to foreign courts.

The really difficult but interesting point to settle is the difference between the *Mahāmātras* attached to the Viceroys and the *Lājavachanikas* under them, on the one hand, and the *Anta-mahāmātras*, on the other. The conceivable difference between them is that the latter were appointed to guard and ad-



minister the marches in all parts of the empire, while the former were held responsible for the good administration of an outlying province or its division as a whole.

As to P. E. II :—

✓ 1. *apāsinave bahukayāne* : In answer to the self-put question —What is

*Dhamma*?—Aśoka mentions six principles in which *Dhamma* consists. The first two of them are *apāsinane* and *bahukayāne*. Here *apāsinave* corresponds in a sense to *apaparīsave* (R. E. X), meaning “little demerit”, “little sin”. In the Jaina *Āchārāṅga Sūtra*, *parissava* and *āsava* are treated as synonyms (*je āsavā te parissavā, je parissavā te āsavā ; je aṇāsavā te aparissavā, je aparissavā te aṇāsavā, ante*, p. 126). In the present edict, *apāsinave* and *bahukayāne* represent two sides of piety, namely, negative and positive : “little sin” and “much good”. And *bahukayāne* or “much good” as an abstract moral quality finds its fulfilment in many good deeds (*bahūni kayānāni*, P. E. II). In R. E. V, however, the expression *bahu-kalāṇam* is employed in a concrete collective sense to mean “many good deeds”. Further, *kayāne kaṭe* of R. E. V and *kayānāni kaṭāni* are just another expression for *sādhavāni kaṭāni* of P. E. VII. In the last-mentioned edict, *sādhavāni* or “good deeds” are but a concrete expression of the moral quality of “goodness” (*sādhave* or *sādhussa bhāva*). Undoubtedly in R. E. V and P. E. III, *kayāne* and *pāpe* occur as antithetical terms, precisely as in the Dhammapada verse exhorting : *abhiṭṭharetha kalyāṇe, pāpā chittam nivāraye*.

By Aśoka's definition *parīsave* is *apuṇa*, “demerit” (R. E. X), the opposite of which is *puṇa* (R. E. X). Be it noted that in the religious literature of India, whether Buddhist, Jaina or Brahmanical, *puṇya* and *pāpa*, *sukṛitam* and *dushkṛitam*, *sādhū* and *asādhū*, and the like are often met with as antithetical pairs of terms. The same is the case with Aśoka's edict. } The way in which P. E. III introduces the two terms *pāpa* and *āsinava* cannot but lead us to think that the latter is just an aspect or side-issue of the former. One can say, *pāpe me kaṭe*, “I have committed sin”, but one cannot say in the same manner *āsinave me kaṭe*. We can very well say with Aśoka : *iyam me pāpe kaṭe ti, iyam vā āsinave nāmā ti*, in which case *āsinave* must be treated as a resultant moral factor of a sinful deed,—of an act of demerit. But what is *āsinava*? According to Bhandarkar, *āsinava* corresponds more to the Jaina *anḥaya* than to the Pali *ādīnava* explained by Buddhaghosa in the sense of *amadhura-bhāva*, *upaddava*, *dosa*. In the Amarakosha, Saṅkīrṇavarga, *ādīnava*, *āsrava* and *kleśa* stand for three allied afflictions due to a disease, the first for the general weakening of the system because of the affections, the second for the infuriating of the active organs, and the third for the ailments. But the derivation of both *ādīnava* and *āsinava* is still in a speculative stage. As for *ādīnava*, the derivation—*ā īśhad-dīnam asty-atra kleśāditi vāt*, suggested in the Amarakosha-Tīkā, is laboured and far-fetched.

In Pali, however, *ādīnava* as troublesome consequence of *pāpa* is invariably



the opposite of *assāda* (*āsuāda*). Bhandarkar rightly points out that none of the Buddhist enumerations of immoral qualities and acts with reference to *ādinava* suits the Aśokan context, while the Jaina enumeration does. He draws our attention to the *Āchārāṅga Sūtra* (P. T. S. Ed., p. 92) where the word *aṇhaya* is found used and translated by Jacobi as "sins". "This suits excellently", observes Bhandarkar (*Aśoka*, p. 134 f.), "because in Pillar Edict III *āsinava* (= *aṇhaya*) has been placed side by side with *pāpa*. The former could not have been exactly identical with the latter in meaning, and we shall not be far from right if we take *āsinava* (*aṇhaya*) to signify 'depravity', 'defilement'. This also seems to be the meaning of *parisava* used by Aśoka in Rock Edict X, where he equates it with *apuṇa* (demerit). Now Jainism specifies eighteen kinds of *pāpa* or sin and forty-two kinds of *āsravas*. These two lists have four malevolent affections in common, called *kashāyas*. Two of these are *krodha* and *māna*, exactly two of the passions named by Aśoka. The *isyā* of Aśoka, again, is to be found in the Jaina list of the *pāpas* as *irshyā* or *dvesha*. *chaṇḍiye* and *niṭhuliye* are alone not traceable, though they are no doubt covered by the malaffection *himsā* mentioned under *āsravas*. Thus the use of the term *āsinava* (*aṇhaya*), distinction between it and *pāpa*, and the inclusion of at least three passions of the Jaina lists are enough to convince anybody that in all likelihood, Aśoka has here adopted and assimilated some psychological concepts of Jainism."

Even accepting the conclusion reached by Bhandarkar and admitting the force of his argument, I wish he had utilised the evidence of the *Aupapātika Sūtra*, Sec. 30 II (*Vināc*), in which the word *aṇhaya* occurs in connexion with *mana-vinaya*. Here it deals with mind, which is *sāvajje* (impure), *sakīriye* (active), *sakakkase* (rough), *kaḍue* (displeasing), *niṭṭhure* (cruel), *phariuse* (rude), *aṇhaya-kare*, *chhedakare* (swayed by the passion of cutting), *bheyakara* (swayed by the passion of piercing), *paritāvaṇakare* (swayed by the passion of causing distress), *uddāvaṇakare* (swayed by the passion of afflicting), and *bhūovaghāie* (inclined to causing hurt to beings). The Commentary reads *alhaka-kare* instead of *aṇhayakare* and equates it with *asraka-karman*. The word as found in the *Praśnavyākaraṇa Sūtra* is definitely *aṇhaya*. One may even go so far as to equate it with *āsrava-karam*, which is paraphrased by *aśubha-karam*. There is no phonetic difficulty in equating *aṇhaya* with *āsinava*. In the order of words expressive of different process of causing hurt to beings, *aṇhaya-kare* is followed by *chhedakare*, *bhedakare*, etc. We find that in the *Āchārāṅga Sūtra* and in several statements *hanana* precedes *chhedana*, hurting beings is the impure and active mind which is rough, displeasing, cruel and rude. Exactly in P. E. III, we find that fierceness (*chaṇḍiye*), cruelty (*niṭhūliye*), wrath (*kodhe*), conceit (*māne*), and malignity (*isyā*) are mentioned as passions that contribute to *āsinava* (*āsinava-gāmini*). If so, the absence of these passions must be referred to the first category of *apāsinave*, "little evil", "little sin", "little depravity", and the four moral qualities, each finding its fulfilment in a practice of piety, must be associated with the second category of *bahukayāne*, "much good".



2. dayā dāne sache sochaye : These are the four moral qualities to be connected with the second category of *bahukayāne*. The first is *dayā* or piety, which is a mental state of kindness leading to *dāna*, "liberality". The Amara-kosha-Tikā aptly suggests : *klaṇḍo kṛpāyām iti nirdeśe, kṛpa-daya-dāne bhidān yañi*. The *anukampā* or "compassion" is felt by superiors for those under them (*anukampe guror aḥ*). This is corroborated by Aśoka when he says in his S. R. E. II : *athā cha atānañ anukampati hevañ anukampati aphe*. The *sacha* or truthfulness is the moral quality which is defined by Aśoka as the courage of speaking truth (*sachañ vataviye*, M. R. E.) and the strength of adhering to the faith (*dadhabhatitā*, R. E. VII, XIII). The *sochaye* or purity is the mental quality which consists essentially in *bhāvasudhitā*, "purity of sentiment," "purity of motive", "purity of heart", and is broadbased upon *sayame*, "self-restraint", "self-control".

3. chakhudāne bahuvidhe diñne : What did Aśoka mean by saying that "he gave eyes in manifold ways"? It goes without saying that *chakhudāna* is *dhammadāne*, "the gift of the doctrine" (R. E. IX, R. E. XI). The means adopted towards this end consisted in *dhammānusathini*, "imparting of instructions in the laws of piety and morality" (R. E. III, R. E. IV, P. E. VII, etc.) Here *chakhu* stands for 'light' (*āloka*), 'knowledge' (*paññāchakkhu*, lit. 'eye of knowledge'). Cp. theragāthā, v. 3 : *ālokadā chakkhudadā* ; Aupapātika Sūtra, Sec. 16 : *chakkhudae*.

4. dupada-chatupadesu pakhi-vālichaesu vividhe me anugahe kaṭe ā-pāna-dākhināye : The implication of this statement may be appreciated partly with the help of R. E. II, and P. E. VII and Queen's Edict, and greatly with that of P. E. V. Aśoka did many kinds of favour to bipeds and quadrupeds by making arrangements for two kinds of medical treatment and by the planting of shade-trees and the excavation of wells and tanks, for the benefit of men and beasts (*pasu-munisānañ*). The shade-trees served also as shelters and perches for the birds. The tanks served as watery home for the fish and no less as resorts of aquatic birds. The water-stations, sitting sheds, rest-houses, alms-houses, and the like were useful to travellers as well as beasts. P. E. V embodies the text of the Regulation of Piety (*dhamma-niyama*) whereby he declared certain species of living beings inviolable, and sought to restrict the time of slaughter of certain other species and to prevent the ruthless destruction of animalculæ.

As to P. E. IV :—

1. atapatiye me kaṭe : Here *atapatiye* is in apposition with *abhihāle* and *daṇḍe*, the award of reward or punishment, the hearing of cases or giving



judgements, in short, the administration of justice which was the normal duty of the *Rajjukas*. The expression *atapatiye kaṭe* means "made a matter for one's own concern". The question is —for whose own concern, the king's or the *Rajjukas*? On this point there exists a sharp difference of opinions. Upon the whole, there are two opinions. By the consensus of opinions held by the Aśokan scholars, the *abhihāla* or *daṇḍa* was made a matter for the *Rajjukas*' own concern. Mr. S. N. Mitra alone is the upholder of the other opinion, that it was a matter for the king's own concern, which is to say, that the king took upon himself the sole responsibility of judicial administration so as to set the *Rajjukas* free to devote their whole energy to preaching and public works. But this opinion seems untenable. The analogy by which Aśoka makes us understand the new situation is that of a father becoming relieved of cares and anxieties on account of his children after entrusting them to the care of a clever nurse capable of taking care of them. If the question be—Who is here the father, who the nurse, and who the children, the reply is—the king himself is the father, the *Rajjukas* the nurse, and the subjects the children. For unmistakably Aśoka took up the position of father and expected his subjects to take up the position of children : *save munise pajā mamā* (S. R. E. I, S. R. E. II). In the present edict, too, Aśoka, while explaining the analogy, says : *hevaṃ mamā lajūkā kaṭā jānapadasa hitasukhāye*, which shows that the sole charge of the good and happiness of the people was given to the *Rajjukas*. The immediate object of this measure was to enable them to work on their own initiative and responsibility without fear, with self confidence. This indicates that before this they had not a free hand as they had to work under constant fear of interference from the higher authority, namely, the king or his deputies. The Pali Jātakas, for instance, record a few instances where, seeing public agitations were against certain judges, the *Senāpati* or Commander-in-chief forcibly turned them out and himself occupied the vacant seat. Thus the judicial administration was under the rule of the military. In the Vṛji system of administration of justice, as described by Buddhaghosa, the king was the highest judiciary of the state, below him was the position of the crown-prince, below him that of the *Senāpati*, below the *Senāpati* that of the Tribunal of Eight (*Atthakulikā*), below this Tribunal that of the *Sūtradharas*, below them that of the *Vyavahārikas*, and below all that of the *Viniścaya-mahāmātras*.

2. *yena maṃ ālādhayitave* : "whereby to please me". In the edicts of Aśoka, exactly as in Pali, the verbal form of *ā-rādḥ* is used in a twofold sense to mean (1) "to obtain", "to attain", cf. Pali *ārādhe nikatipaṇṇo*, and (2) "to please", cf. Milindapaṇṇa, p. 210 : *itthī sāmikassa santaken' eva dhanena sāmikam ārādheti toseti pasādeti ; kappako raṇṇo suṇken' eva suvaṇṇapaṇakena-rājānam ārādheti toseti pasādeti*. The same is also the case with Sanskrit, cf. Amarakosha, Nānārtha-varga : *ārādhanam sādhanam syāt avāptau toshane' pi cha*.



The word *ārādhana* has for its synonyms *sāadhanā* (accomplishment), *avāpti* (attainment), and *toshana* (pleasing).

3. *viyohāla-samatā daṇḍa-samatā* : Lit., "uniformity of procedure, uniformity of judgement". The delegation of full authority to the *Rajjukas* in matters judicial, implying as it did the grant of discretionary powers to them by the king, was intended for the establishment and maintenance of uniformity in the administration of justice (*kiṃtī viyohāla-samatā cha siyā daṇḍa-samatā cha*). This shows that such uniformity was wanting theretofore. The desired uniformity must have been intended to widen the scope for the application of equity as a principle of justice.

4. *āvuti* : "order" (Bhandarkar) ; "injunction" (Mookerji). I have translated it by "application of safeguard". In S. R. E. I, the word *anāvuti* in the sense of "non-application" occurs as a synonym of *ālasiya* (indolence) and *kila-matha* (weariness for exertion), and *āvuti* is apparently the opposite of *anāvuti*. The same meaning of *āvuti* or *āyuti* may be consistently adhered to even in interpreting the expression *desāvutike hosāmi* (S. R. E. II), "I will apply myself to the service of the country". The interpretation of *āvuti* in the sense of 'order' or 'injunction' may be justified. The word may even be quoted with Sk. *āvṛit*, meaning 'arrangement'.

5. *yote diṃne* : Here the only important point to discuss is whether *yote* should be equated with the Sk. *yautakam*, *yautukam*, or with *yotram*. Kern's equation of the word with *yautakam* has so far held the field. On this point Bhandarkar (*Aśoka*, p. 345) comments thus : "Kern rightly connects (*yote*) with the Sanskrit *yautaka* and (it) is taken by European scholars in the sense of 'respite'. But *yautaka* does not mean 'respite' but 'something exclusively and rightfully belonging to a person'. This sense is by no means inapplicable here". It would seem that Bhandarkar has overstrained his argument. Early literature of India shows no use of the word *yautaka* or *yautuka* except in the sense of 'something received by a woman by way of dowry or wedding present, and hence forming her exclusive property' (*vide Śabdakalpadrūma, subvoce yautukam*). With me *yote* is the Prakrit equivalent of the Pali *yottam* and the Sk. *yotram*, and the idiom is an Indo-European idiom, "given full scope, rope, i. e., respite (of three days)."

6. *nātikā va kāni nijhapayisanti jīvitāye tānaṃ* : Translated by "relatives will persuade them (the *Rajjukas*) to revise decision for sparing life". The idea of revision is suggested in the context where the remedy sought for is the remedy after the death-sentence has been passed on the persons prosecuted under



the law. In the *Jātaka gāthās* (*Jātaka*, VI, p. 516), the expression *nijjhāpetum* is employed in the sense of "convincing the judge of the innocence of the accused" (*niddosabhāvaṃ jānāpetum*, gloss). As for the means thereto, the *Ayoghara Jātaka* (*Jātaka*, IV, p. 495) adds by way of gloss "openly claiming one's innocence by producing witnesses and persuading the judge to accept it as such" (*sakkhīhi attano niraparādhābhāvaṃ pakāsetvā pasādetvā*). This is applied to all persons who are prosecuted and stand trial as criminals (*aparādhakā hetthakā*). Thus in the *Jātaka* commentary we get a technical meaning of the legal term *nijjhāpana*.

Mr. S. N. Mitra, however, contends (*I. C.*, Vol. I, p. 121 f.) for a different meaning of *nijjhāpana* when he observes: "*nijhāpayisanti* (in Aśokan context) would signify not 'revising the case' but interceding on behalf of the criminal not only with the king but also with the royal agents". He takes his stand on a statement in the *Milindapañha*, p. 109, which reads: *Yathā, mahārāja, dhana-yasa-siri-ñātibalena balavā puriso attano ñātīm vā mittam vā raññā garudaṇḍam dhārentam attano bahuvisatthabhāvena samatthatāya garukam daṇḍam lahukam kāreti*, "Just as, O great king, a person powerful on the strength of his wealth, fame, prosperity and people causes a heavy punishment to be commuted on account of his (great) influence by way of intimate contacts in the case of a relative or friend who has received a heavy punishment from the king (*i. e.*, judge)."

Further, on the strength of another statement in the *Milindapañha*, p. 209, Mr. Mitra suggests that "the expression *jīvītāye tānam* would imply rather "the barest sparing of life and reduction of punishment than release." The instance given in this text is that of a criminal condemned to death was just spared his life for the timely intercession of an influential person who took pity on him.

Lastly, as borne out by the same work, the *nijjhāpana* was resorted to as means of obtaining pardon for the guilty by other persons evincing an interest in them, *e. g.*, the *Śākyas* of *Chātumā* and *Brahmā Sahampati* most humbly appealed to the Blessed One, begged pardon, argued for reconsideration on behalf of the condemned fraternity (*bijūpamam cha vachchhataruṇūpamam cha upadassetvā Bhagavantam pasādesum khamāpesum nijjhattam akāmsu*).

It is easy to accept Mr. Mitra's suggestion that by the word *nātikā* in the present edict we are to understand not only the nearest relatives of the convicts but also other persons interested who might be counted among their friends, comrades, associates, companions, neighbours, and acquaintances,—that, in other words, here the relatives typify all persons expected to evince a keen interest in them.

There is no escape from the idea of interceding or intercession in its primary sense of 'pleading with a person for another'. In the Aśokan statement, the *nātikas* are the typical persons expected to intercede or plead with the judges for a person on whom the death sentence has been passed. But Mr. Mitra has not cited any instance where *nijjhāpana* is used in any sense but convincing the



judge of the innocence of the unfortunate person punished as a criminal. Aśoka himself has specifically mentioned the conditions of release of prisoners before they have served out the term of imprisonment (R. E. V), which means by way of commutation of the sentence passed by the court.

Lastly, the barest sparing of life by way of diminishing the death sentence already passed is the minimum sense of *jīvitāye tānaṃ*, which verbally corresponds to *jīvitam rakkhēyyam* in the Milindapañha, p. 110. The sentence is so far lessened that the person punished as a criminal is not to be beheaded, but his limbs are to be cut off (*kiṃ sīsachchhedanena, hattham vā pādāṃ vā chhin-ditvā jīvitam rakkhatha*). But Aśoka's expression *jīvitāye tānaṃ* does not preclude its maximum sense of total release from the mischief of the law. In this connexion Mookerji cites the Buddhist tradition from the Dīvyāvadāna which "represents Asoka as abolishing capital punishment altogether on having put to death a monk who happened to be his own brother". This, however, lacks corroboration from the edict in question.

7. *nāsaṃtaṃ vā nijhapayitā, nijhapayitave* : Out of the six versions of the edict, two only read *nijhapayitā*, signifying "a person to plead for", and the rest, *nijhapayitave*, meaning simply "to plead". The variations in reading might have been completely ignored but for the dispute over the interpretation of *nāsaṃtaṃ*.

A *gāthā* in the Ayoghara Jātaka (Jātaka, IV, p. 495) speaks of two kinds of *nijjhāpana*, namely, that resorted to with a view to making the earthly king relent and that resorted to with a view to making Death relent. According to the Commentary, the means of making the earthly king relent consists in appealing to and convincing him of the innocence of accused persons by calling reliable witnesses, and that of making the heavenly king of death relent consists in propitiating him with religious offerings (*balikammavasena khamāpentī pasādentī*). And Aśoka, too, speaks of something to be done here for the sparing of life, and failing that, of something to be done for placing the convicts in good stead hereafter. Were the word *nāsaṃsaṃ* (*nīsaṃsaṃ*) instead of *nāsaṃtaṃ*, there would have been no difficulty in taking it to mean Yama, whose appropriate epithet would be *nīsaṃsa*, "the cruel one". But the spelling invariably is *nāsaṃtaṃ*. Referring to my note published in 1926, Bhandarkar observes (Aśoka, p. 346) : In the "Jātaka *nijjhāpana* is predicated not only of the king but also of *Mṛityu* or death [*labhanti te rājino nijjhajetum, na machchuno nijjhapanam karonti*]. This fits here also, with just a small difference. For, instead of the king, we have here the *Rajjukas*. *Mṛityu* may easily be recognised in the word *nāsaṃta* = *nās-ānta* = "(One) whose nature or disposition (*anta*) is destruction (*nāsa*). *Anta* in this sense is too well-known to require any explanation. There will thus be a twofold propitiation according to Aśoka : (1) propitiation of the *Rajjukas* by the relatives of the convicts by adducing



proofs of their innocence; and (2) the propitiation of Death by the convicts themselves."

It is equally possible to agree with Lüders in construing *nāsamītam* in the sense of "not being", "there being none to propitiate the *Rajjukas*," or "there being none to plead."

Two points go against Lüders. Firstly, that throughout the edicts the negative particle is spelt as *na* or *no*. Secondly, the infinitive *najhapayitave* requires a person for its object. Whether one or the other, the import of the clause is the same.

As to P. E. V :—

1. *imāni jātāni avadhiyāni kaṭāni* : "These creatures are declared inviolable", inviolable by a *dhamma-niyama*, which is to say, under the law (P. E. VII). As a biological term, *jāta* signifies 'species' : *jātir jātāṇ cha sāmānye* (Amara-kosha, Svarga-varga). In Pali, the word *jāta* generally goes together with *bhūta* : *jātaṁ bhūtaṁ*, and literally it means 'that which is born, in a particular genus or species'. The pronominal adjective *imāni*, "these", cannot but suggest that the list of species mentioned by name was intended to be exhaustive, while, in point of fact, the list which follows is typical only. The expression *avadhiyāni kaṭāni*, "declared inviolable", "rendered immune from violation", may be treated as the same as *abhaya-dinnāni*, *abhaya-laddhāni* (Nigrodhamiga Jātaka), or *pradisitābhayāḥ* of Kauṭilya (Arthaśāstra, II. 26). But the very word *avadhiyāḥ* is met with in the Arthaśāstra (II. 26). Obviously Kauṭilya divides the *avadhiyas* under these three subheads : (1) *maṅgalyāḥ* or auspicious creatures, (2) *pradisitābhayāḥ* or protected creatures, and (3) *aprayitta-vadhāḥ* or harmless creatures. The *maṅgalyas* deserving to be protected from all kinds of molestation are typified in the Arthaśāstra by (a) elephants, horses or other animals having the form (physiognomy) of men, sea-bulls or sea-asses, and such other auspicious beasts ; (b) fishes in tanks, lakes, channels and rivers, and such other auspicious fishes ; and (c) the *krauñcha* (a kind of heron), *utkrośaka* (osprey), *dātyūha* (a variety of cuckoo), *haṁsa* (swan ?), *chakravāka* (a brahmany duck), *jīvañjīvaka* (a kind of pheasant), *bhīṣṅgarāja* (*Lanius Malabaricus*), *chakora* (partridge), *mattakokila* (cuckoo proper), *mayūra* (peacock), *śuka* (parrot), *madanaśārīka* (*maina*), and such other auspicious birds.

The *pradisitābhayas* deserving to be protected from entrapping, killing or molestation consist of deer, bison, birds and fishes that are declared to be under state protection or that live in reserve forests (*abhayāranya*), e. g., cattle, wild beasts (*vyāla*), elephants, and fishes.

The *aprayittavadhas* are simply defined as those creatures, birds, beasts such as deer or fishes that do not prey on other animals.

Kauṭilya forbids the violation of these creatures under the penalty imposed



by law, and provides exceptions in the case of those that live in state protected forests. The creatures that live in such forests, if they become turbulent, should be entrapped and killed outside the forest preserve.

The Nigrodhamiga, Ruru, and few other Jātakas record instances of the boon of state protection (*abhayam*) granted by Indian kings in the past on solemn promise and under moral persuasion first to the deer in the sense of all species of antelopes, next to all quadrupeds, then to all kinds of birds, and finally to all fishes that live in water.

Aśoka's list of *avadhya jātas*, precisely like that of Kauṭilya, includes creatures that belong to these three categories of birds, quadrupeds, and fishes.

Although motivated by the spirit of *ahiṃsā* or *avihiṃsā*, Aśoka's was not an idealistic or utopian scheme, which was not enforceable under the law. He was guided in this matter, particularly with reference to all quadrupeds, by this twofold consideration: *ye paṭibhagaṃ no eti na cha khādīyati*, "that do not come into man's use, nor are eaten by men".

His illustrative list of birds mentions by name *suka*, *sālikā*, *aluna*, *chakavāka*, *hamsa*, *naṃdimukha*, *gelāṭa*, the bird-like *jatūkā*, *ambā-kapīlikā* (or, bird-like *jātu*, *kāambā*, *kapīlikā*), *gāma-kapota*, and *seta-kopota*. Four of them, viz., *suka*, *sālikā*, *chakavāka* and *hamsa*, belong, as pointed out by Mookerji, to Kauṭilya's list of auspicious birds.

His list of fishes consists of *duḷi* (an amphibious quadruped often associated with fish), *anaṭhikamachha*, *vedaveyaka* (*chedaveyaka*?), *gaṃgāpuputaka*, and *saṃkujamachha*.

And his list of quadrupeds is typified by *kaphaṭasayaka* (?), *paṃnasasa*, *simala*, *saṃḍaka*, *okaṇḍa*, and *palasata*.

Similar lists of birds, fishes and quadrupeds are found to be associated in the Jātakas and Apadānas with the famous hermitages (*assamas*) of old.

2. suke : Aśoka's list of birds begins with *suka* (Sk. *śuka*), "the parrot", exactly as that in the Jaina Aupapātika Sūtra, sec. 4.

3. sālikā : This corresponds to *śārikā* or *sārikā*. The name *śārikā* is applicable to a female parrot as well as to a *madana-śālikā*, *madana* or *mayna*, *maina*. In Kauṭilya's list of auspicious birds, the name of *śuka* is followed by that of *madanaśārikā*. In the Aupapātika Sūtra, Sec. 4, the name of *suya* (*śuka*) is followed by those of *barhiṇa* (peacock) and *mayana-sāla* (= *mayana-salāgā*, equated with *madana-salākā*). The Vessantara Jātaka associates *suva* with *sālikā* (*suva-sālikā*) and *kokila* (*suva-kokilā*), while the Śāriputtāpadāna mentions *kokila* apart from *suka-sūḷi*.

4. alune chakavāke : Bhandarkar treats *alune*, equated with *aruṇa*, "ruddy", as an adjective to *chakavāka*, Sk. *chakravāka*, which is the familiar brahmany



duck. Evidently *aluna* and *chakavāka* are two allied but different birds. In no branch of Indian literature the *chakravāka* is described as ruddy or glowingly red. Going by the Hindu mythology regarding the relationship between *Aruṇa* and *Garuḍa*, I incline to take *aruṇa* to be "a generic name of all rapacious birds of prey, eagles, ospreys, vultures and kites" (*ante*, p. 208). But Aśoka's list seems to have precluded such birds. The mention of rapacious birds in between *sālīkā* and *chakavāka* is unexpected. In the Aupapātika Sūtra, Sec. 4, the name of *barahiṇa* (peacock) comes in between those of *suya* (*śuka*) and *mayana-sāla*, and that of *chakavāka* between those of *kāraṇḍa* (= *kāraṇḍava*) and *kalahaṃsa*, while in the Aśokan enumeration the name of *chakavāka* is put between *aluna* and *haṃsa*. The Vessantara Jātaka, on the other hand, associates the name of *chākavāka* (*chakravāka*) as a bird that roams about in rivers with those of *ravihaṃsa* and charmingly resounding *vāraṇa* (*ravihaṃsā chākavākā nādi-charā vāraṇābhīrudā rammā*). Seeing that *aruṇa* is just another name for the sun we may identify Aśoka's *aluna*, *aruṇa* with the *ravihaṃsa* of the Jātaka, or, in the alternative, with *vāraṇa* or *vāruṇa* (cf. *varuṇo varaṇaḥ*, Amarakosha, Vanaushadhi-varga). The Vessantara Jātaka distinguishes, however, between the two varieties of *vāraṇas*, one associated with *bheṇḍgarāja* (*bhīṇḍgarāja*), *kādamba* (*kādamba*) and *suva-kokilā*, and the other, namely, the charmingly resounding species, which is associated with *ravihaṃsa* and *chākavāka*.

5. *haṃsa* : The Aupapātika Sūtra, Sec. 4, associates *chakavāka* with *kalahaṃsa*, the Arthaśāstra, with *haṃsa*, while the Vessantara Jātaka associates *haṃsa* with *kurara* and *āṭa* (a spoon-faced bird) and distinguishes it from *chākahaṃsa* (*chakvahaṃsa*) and *ravihaṃsa*. The Jātaka-Commentary defines the *haṃsa* as white bodied ducks (*setasakuṇa-haṃsā*), the Amarakosha, which, too, distinguishes the *haṃsa* from the *kalahaṃsa* and *rājahaṃsa*, describes it as a species of white-winged ducks that hail from the Mānas Sarovar and resemble the *chakravākas* in their bodily shape (*haṃsās tu śveta-garutaś-chakrāṅgā Mānasaukashah*). The Chullahaṃsa Jātaka (Fausböll, No. 533), too, connects the *haṃsas* belonging to the Dhārtarāshṭra family with the Mānusiyaśara. The Mahāhaṃsa Jātaka (No. 534) describes them as gold-coloured (*suvaṇṇavaṇṇā*), while, according to the Amarakosha and its Tīkā, the *haṃsas* of this family are a bigger species of ducks whose bills and feet are ebony (*krishṇaś-chañchu-charaṇair-viśiṣṭāḥ*). If so, we must reject 'swans' as an interpretation of Aśoka's *haṃsa*.

6. *naṇḍīmukhe* : The *naṇḍīmukha*, same as *naṇḍīmuha* in the Aupapātika Sūtra, Sec. 4 and the Praśnavyākaraṇa Sūtra, I. I. This bird, as pointed out by Monimohan Chakravarti, finds mention also in the medical treatises. In the Aupapātika Sūtra, the name of *naṇḍīmuha* is preceded by that of *jīvaṃjīvaga* and followed by that of *kavila* (*kapila*), while in the Praśnavyākaraṇa Sūtra, the



bird is closely associated with *naṁdamāṇaga*. The Jaina scholiasts treat *naṁdī-muḥa* and *naṁdamāṇaga* as "two varieties of *sārikā* or *maina* [*sārikāviśeshāḥ*] rather than of any aquatic bird", and describe them "as being small birds measuring only two fingers in length and accustomed to rest on the ground at night", which has nothing but ingenuity to commend itself.

We have still to decide whether the Sanskrit equivalent of the name is *nandī-mukha* or *nāndī-mukha*. It must be the former, for the latter is not used as a substantive. The *nāndī-mukha* is an ancient Hindu domestic rite in which the *Pitris* (*Pitaras*) or *manes* look forward to receiving oblations from their *putras* or descendants on earth. The *Purāṇas* assign to Nandī, the attendant of Mahādeva, the function of obtaining from the Lord the boon of the birth of sons for a votary. So we read in the *Kūrma Purāṇa*, Ch. 40: *Śilādām "tāta tāte" ti prāha Nandī punaḥ punaḥ | taṁ dṛiṣṭvā nandināṁ jātāṁ Śilādāḥ parishasvaje ||* This cannot but lead us to identify Aśoka's *naṁdī-mukha* with the *nandikas* of the *Vessantara Jātaka*. The *nandikas*, otherwise called *jīva-puttā*, are described as birds that set up the onomatopoeitic cry of *piyā puttā*, *piyā nandā*, and live in a pond (*poḥkharanīgharā*). The *naṁdī-mukha* is a class of birds that have in their mouth the onomatopoeitic cry of *piyā puttā* *piyā nandā*.

7. *gelāṭe*: Monmohan Chakravarti, identifies *gelāṭe* with *golattikā* in the *Taittirīya Saṁhitā*, V. 5. 16. But the equation is far-fetched. One might propose the *gorāṭi* of Hemachandra or the *gorāṇṭikā* of the *Rājanirghaṇṭa*, both meaning the *sārikā*. But a name denoting the *sārikā* is redundant in Aśoka's list. Over and above this, the equation is not phonetically justifiable. The same remark holds true of the *karāṭa* meaning 'crow' and the *kareṭu*, *karkareṭu* meaning 'woodpecker'. *Gelāṭa* is evidently a word like *byāghrāṭa* (*byāghra iva aṭati*, *Amarakosha-Ṭikā*) meaning the bird otherwise called *bhavadvāja*, and *dhūmyāṭa* (*dhūmyām aṭati*) meaning the bird otherwise called *kaliṅgabhrīṅga*. Aśoka's *gelāṭa* suggests a Sanskrit equivalent like *kirāṭa* (*kira iva aṭati*), and it must mean a bird which walks like a *kira* or boar (*Amarakosha*, *Siṁhādivarga*, and its *Ṭikā*). The *Vessantara Jātaka* mentions the *āṭa* as a class of spoon-faced birds (*dabbisaṇṭhāna-mukha-sakuṇā*), probably a variety of ducks.

8. *jatūkā* (*jatūka*) *ambā-kapilikā*, —*kapilikā*, —*kapilika*: One might be tempted to read *jatū kāmbā* (*kaambā*) *kapilikā* (*kapilikā*, *kapilika*), which would be *ultra vires*, inasmuch as *jatūka* is carefully kept distinct in all the copies from the next word. According to the *Amarakosha*, *Siṁhādivarga*, the *jatūkā* or *jatūkā* is the same creature as the *ajinapatrā* or *charmachaṭikā* (bat, flying fox). In the *Atharvaveda*, however, the name of the creature is simply *jatū*, in which case *kā* might be separated from it and connected with *ambā* to make up the name *kāambā* or *kādambā*, a variety of ducks (*haṁsa-viśeshāḥ*), the



*kalahamsas* according to the Amarakosha. In Pali, *kapillikā* or *kipillikā* stands definitely for the Sk. *pipīlikā*; even we have mention of *tamba-kapillikā* or copper-red ants. Bühler took Aśoka's *ambā-kapīlikā* to mean "queen ants". But we find that the word *ambaka* or *ambakā* is used in Pali also in the sense of *khuddaka* or *khuddakā*, "small", "lesser", cp. *ambaka-maddari* or *ambaka-pachhari* (Aṅguttara-N., I, p. 188) = *khuddaka-kukkuṭikā* (Comy.), in which case the name *ambā-kapīlikā* may be taken to mean "small ants". The ants seem out of place in a list, which is obviously of birds or bird-like creatures. In the Jaina Praśnavyākaraṇa Sūtra, I. I. we have a list of birds which includes the name of *pīpīliya* (*pīpīlika*) or *pī-pītikāraka* (the *pī-pī* crying bird, the *jal-piñ-piñ* of Bengal). It is the diminutive form *kapīlikā*, *kapīlikā* (*pīpīlikā*) that is given in the edict,—*ambā-kapīlikā*, "small *pīpīlika*", cp. *pīpīlikā* as a diminutive from of *pīpīlika*. One might propose also *kapīlika* or *kapīlikā* as a diminutive form of *kapila*, Ardhamāgadhi *kavila* mentioned just after *naṇḍimuha* in the Aupapātika Sūtra, Sec. 4.

9. *duḷi*, *duḷi*, *duḷi* : A female tortoise (*kamaṭhī*, Amarakosha, Pātālavarga; *kachchhupī*, Hemchandra's Deśināmamālā; *kamaṭhyām strī*, Medinī). Monmohan Chakravarti, however, observes that *duḷi* means "a small tortoise" according to Rāyamukuta, Medinī and Hārāvalī. It seems to stand for terrapins, as suggested by Mookerji.

10. *anaṭhikamachhe* : Lit., "the boneless fish". The prawns or shrimps, the jelly-fish and the star-fish are typical examples of boneless or invertebrate fishes (*ante*, p. 208).

11. *vedaveyake* : The name is a matronymic from *vedavā*, Sk. *vidravā*, meaning something easily eluding the grasp. In the alternative, the name may be equated with *viḷapilaka*, which means eels or eel like fishes that live in mud (*paṃkagāḍakaḥ*, *brahmī*), probably the cylindrical snake-headed eels prohibited in the law-books. As for the phonetic change of *j* into *d*, cp. *palitijitu*, *palitiditu* (R. E. X, Yc, K); also Pasenaji (Barhut Inscriptions, Sk. Prasenajit) and Pali Pasenadi.

Assuming that *vedaveyake* is a scribe's error for *chedaveyake*, the intended fish may be identified with *chitravallikah* or *pāṭhina* (*silurus boalis*, a sheet fish).

12. *gaṃgāpupūtake* : Hitherto unidentified. The Sanskrit equivalent of *pupūtake* is either *pupūtake*, *kukkuṭaka* or *pīpītake*. Presumably this is the name of a kind of fish. Had it been the name of a bird, it would have been easy to identify the *gaṃgāpupūtake* with *gaṃgākukkuṭaka*, *gaṃgāchilli*, *jalaku-*



*kkuṭī*, *gāṅgchil* or black-headed gull. If it be the name of a fish, as it undoubtedly seems to be, there is nothing in Pali, Prakrit or Sanskrit to correspond to it. In Sanskrit the name *gaṅgāṭeya* is applied to prawns or shrimps. The word *puppuṭaka* may be taken to mean a fish or fish-like creature having a swollen or lumpy body, and this may lead one to think of porpoises. And *gaṅgākukkuṭaka* may be taken to mean the flying fish. The word *pipītaka* means something which is terribly hungry and thirsty. But this lead us nowhere.

13. *saṅkujamachhe* : Literally translated by "contracting fish". The appropriateness of this rendering is open to dispute. The Amarakosha-Ṭīkā applies the name *śāntkocha* to an aquatic animal (*jala-jantu*) called *śaṅku* in the Amarakosha, Pātālavarga, while in Bengali the skate fish is called *śākach*. The skate is just a species of ray fish (flat and cartilaginous), allied to shark. In Chittagong dialect, the name *hāñach* (*śākach*) applies to a flat, circular, lumpy in the upper part and whip-tailed variety of ray fish. Monmohan Chakravarti draws attention to *saṅkuchi* in the Bhojaprabandha.

14. *kaphaṭasayake*, *-seyake* : This has hitherto been treated as a collective name for "tortoises and porcupines" (*kamaṭha-śalyakam*). This is unacceptable, first, because other names in the list stand for a single species or group of creatures ; and secondly, because it is difficult to equate *kaphaṭa* with *kamaṭha*, and *sayaka*, *seyaka* with *śalyaka*. We have in the edict *tuphe* for *tumhe*, whereas here the Sanskrit equivalent is *kamaṭha*, and not *kamhaṭha*. Similarly we have *kayāne* for *kalyāṇam* but nowhere *keyāne*. On the other hand, both *-sayaka* and *-seyaka* may be equated in Pali with the Sk. *-śāyin*, e. g., *guhāsaya*, *gabūhaseyyaka*, *uttānaseyyaka*. So the name must be construed as '*kaphaṭa-śāyī*', "sleep-feigning". As examples of sleep-feigning animals, one may mention the crocodiles and alligators that are not eatable according to the law-books. The fact which goes against the identification of *kaphaṭasayake*, *-seyake* with tortoises and porcupines is that the meat of these two five-toed quadrupeds is not forbidden in the ancient law-books of the Brahmins, and secondly, the embargo is already laid on *duḥi*.

15. *paṁnasase* : The Sanskrit equivalent is *parṇaśaśa*, which is nowhere found as yet. But we certainly have the group name *parṇamṛiga* to denote monkeys (also called *śākhāmṛiga*), squirrels, etc. (*vanaukas vrikshamārjāra-vrikshamarkaṭikādayah*, Suśruta. The denotation of the name is restricted to squirrels, even to "the large white-bellied red squirrel". I see no great difficulty in taking *paṁnasasa* in a wider sense to mean the same thing as *parṇamṛiga*.

16. *simale* : Sk. *śīmarah*. This is accurately identified by Monmohan



Chakravarti (*ante*, p. 138). The Amarakosha, *Simhādivarga*, mentions the *Śrī-mara* in its list of deer (*harīṇas*).

17. *saṁḍake* : Same as Sk. *śaṇḍaḥ*, *shaṇḍaḥ*. With Bühler Aśoka's *saṁḍaka* stands for the bull set at liberty, while in the Dharma and Gṛīhyasūtras such bulls are called *utsṛishṭa-vrshaḥ*. Even the bull set at liberty must be counted among the domesticated beasts, while Aśoka's list is evidently intended for wild beasts. The Sudhābhojana and Vidhurapaṇḍita Jātakas speak of wild buffaloes (*mahisa*), while the Vessantara Jātaka mentions wild cattle (*goṇasirā*, *arañña-goṇā*).

Seeing that in both the Jātaka enumerations of quadrupeds the *palasata* (*palāsāda*) and the *gavaja* (*gavaya*) are mentioned side by side, I shall not be surprised if Aśoka's *saṁḍaka* was a name intended for the *gavaja* (*gayāl* or wild ox).

18. *okapiṇḍe* : This is rightly equated with *ukkapinḍaka* in the Vinaya P. I, pp. 211, 239 (*ante*, pp. 138, 209).

19. *palasate* : Same as the Pali *palasata*, *palāsāda* (Jātaka, V, p. 406) meaning *khagga*, *khadga*, rhinoceros. The Jātaka Commentary suggests *balasatā* as a variant for *palasatā* (Jātaka, VI, p. 277).

20. *setakapote gāmakapote* : In the Amarakosha, *Simhādivarga*, *pārāvata* and *kapota* are treated as synonyms. Kullūka at Manu, V. II, defines the *pārāvata* as *grāma-vāsi* pigeon, which is to say, as Aśoka's *gāmakapota*. The Charaka-saṁhitā (Sūtrasthāna, XXVII. 54-59) distinguishes between the *gṛīhavāsi* and the *vanavāsi kapota*. The first is evidently no other than what is called *gṛīha-kapota*, *gharakapota*, *gṛīhakukkuta*, domestic pigeons (*ante*, p. 138; Śabdakalpādruma, *subvoce* *kapota*). Among the village pigeons, there are some that pass as wild and uncared for and some that are domesticated and taken care of by their owners. The village pigeons that shift for themselves form a species by themselves and are not generally eaten by the Indians. The *vanavāsi* or *vana-kapota* is the dove (*chitrakaṇṭha*, *ghughu*) according to the Medinī.

By Aśoka's *seta-kapota*, "the white pigeon", we should understand the *vana-kapota* or dove. The Pali expression *aṭṭhikāni setāni*, "white bones" (Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta, Majjhima-N. I), corresponds to *kāpotakāni* (*pārāvata-pakkha-vannāni*) *aṭṭhīni* (Sāmaññaphala Sutta, Dīga-N. I). We shall see below that Aśoka's *gāmakapota* and *setakapota* correspond to the *pārāvata* and the *pāṇḍu-kapota* in Vasishṭha's law-book, XIV. 48. The *kapotas* or *gṛīha-kapotas* are eatable but not the *pārāvata* and the *pāṇḍu-kapota*. The *pārāvata* or *grāma-kapota* is no other than what is known as *jaṅgli pāyrā*, *jālālī* or *jānālī kabutar* in Bengal.

21. *save chatupade ye paṭibhogam no eti na cha khādiyati* : "All quadrupeds that do not come into (men's) use and are not eaten." In view of the typical



list the qualifying clause, "that do neither come into use nor are eaten", is somewhat misleading. The quadrupeds mentioned by name are all wild beasts, and they preclude the deer other than *śṛimara*, and they exclude elephants, horses, lions, tigers, bears and other ferocious beasts. Aśoka's list of *avadhya* *jātas* is not at all concerned with domestic birds and beasts, —with the live-stocks of householders. There is not a word about the reptiles, crocodiles, and sharks. It sadly falls far short of the Jaina and Ājīvika ideal of *ahiṃsā*, and of the Jātaka demand for the boon of state-protection to all quadrupeds, birds and fishes. Aśoka's modest list of creatures declared inviolable under the law is substantially the same as Kauṭilya's list of *avadhyas* on different grounds. Now it behoves us to examine how far Aśoka's list of *avadhyas* agrees with the Brahmin law-givers' list of *abhakshyas* or creatures forbidden as food.

The names common to the two lists of birds are those of *śuka*, *śārikā* (*sārikā*, Manu, V. 12), *chakravāka* (*chakrāṅga*, Manu, V. 12), *hamsa*, *pārāvata* corresponding to Aśoka's *gūmakapota*, and *pāṇḍukapota* corresponding to Aśoka's *setakapota*, the list relied on being that given in the law-book of Vasishṭha, XIV. 49. For *pāṇḍukapota*, cp. Pali *paṇḍuveluva*, 'whitish bamboo' (Vessantara Jātaka), *paṇḍu* meaning *paṇḍupalāsavanna* (Vidhurapaṇḍita Jātaka): *pāṇḍus tu dhū-sarah* (Amarakosha, Svargavarga).

The law-givers' list of forbidden fishes has no common name to offer.

Their list of forbidden animals, too, does not explicitly present a common name. On the contrary, it excludes in some instances the *khadga* (*palasata*) or rhinoceros which is included in the list of Aśoka.

The general rules laid down in the law-books for the guidance of the Brahmins in the matter of eating meat and fish may be briefly stated as follows :

The five-toed (*pañchanakha*) animals are forbidden with certain exceptions. The number of exceptions varies from five to seven. The minimum of five is allowed by Bodhāyana and Vasishṭha with both of whom the custom of the Aryandom (*Āryāvarta*) of a very limited area between the Himalayas and the Pāriyātra mountain, and more definitely between the Ganges and the Yamunā, was the standard. The maximum of seven is offered by Āpastamba whose authority prevailed in the south. The list of five comprises the dog-faced boar called *śvāvid*, the iguana (*godhā*), the porcupine (*śalyaka*), the tortoise (*kachchhapa*), and the hare (*śaśa*). The list of six given by Gautama and Manu has the additional name of *khadga* or rhinoceros, while Āpastamba's list adds one more name, namely, *pūtikhasha* (an animal resembling a hare and found in the Himalayas, according to Haradatta).

The two-hoofed animals with the exception of the deer called *śarya*, the *prishata*, the buffalo, the boar (*varāha*) and the reindeer (*kuraṅga*) are disallowed. Even the *kuraṅga* is tabooed by Bodhāyana. Āpastamba discards all one-hoofed animals. Bodhāyana condemns all village (*i. e.*, domestic) animals (the cow, the horse, the ass, the camel) with the exception of goats, while



Vasishṭha allows all animals having a single row of teeth with the exception of camels (*anushṭrā*).

Gautama prohibits not only those animals which are one-hoofed (*e. g.*, horses, asses, mules) but also those which have a double row of teeth, those which are covered with an excessive quantity of hair (*e. g.*, the yak or *Bos grunniens*), and those which have no hair (*e. g.*, snakes).

Vasishṭha forbids the *gavaya*, the porpoise, the alligator and the crab among the aquatic beings, and the cattle, the *gayal* and the *śarabha* (eight-legged deer) among the terrestrial animals, and so far as the prohibition of the meat of the *gayal*, village pigs, *śarabhas* and cattle goes, Vasishṭha and Āpastamba agree. The point in which they differ is that following the tradition of the Vājasaneyas, the latter allows the meat of milch-cows and oxen. Gautama is against eating milch cows and draught-oxen. But he is equally against the meat of animals whose milk-teeth have not fallen away, which are diseased as well as those which are not killed for sacred purposes.

The Buddha's prohibition of the meat of the lion, the tiger, the bear, the panther, the hyena, and the dog, even in times of food-scarcity (*Viṇaya Mahāvagga*, VI) conforms to the five-toed rule ; that of the meat of snakes to the no-hair-animal rule ; and that of the meat of elephants and horses to the tame animal rule.

As regards birds, Gautama allows those which feed striking with their beaks or scratching with their feet. Āpastamba, on the other hand, prohibits only the cock (*i. e.*, village fowls) amongst those which feed scratching with their feet, and the heron called *plava* (or *śakāṭabīla*). Among the birds that feed scratching with their feet (*vivishkirā*), the *tittira* (partridge), the *kapota* (pigeon), the *kapiñjala* (swallow), the *vārdhrāṇasa* (a kind of crane, Pali *byagghīṇasa*, *Vessantara-Jātaka*) the *mayūra* (peafowl) and the *vāraṇa* (otherwise called *hatthilinga*, *Vessantara Jātaka*) are passed as eatable. Bodhāyana discards the *vāraṇa*. The birds that fly at night (*i. e.*, owls, night hawks) and that are web-footed are prohibited by Gautama, and likewise those which are born in water and those which have red feet and beaks. Forbidden are all carnivorous birds, *e. g.*, crows, vultures, kites, falcons and eagles. In the language of Manu (V. 13), the birds that dive and live on fish, meat from a slaughter house and dried meat are to be avoided.

Vasishṭha's list of forbidden birds is formidable, although it precludes certainly the birds that are declared eatable by Bodhāyana, including peafowls. The peacock is the only bird which, as pointed out by Bhandarkar (*Aśoka*, p. 187), "has been forbidden by most of the Smṛitis but served as an article of food in the time of Aśoka".

The precautionary rule goes against eating solitary (*ekachara*) and unknown beasts and birds, though they may fall under the category of eatable creatures.

As for fishes, Vasishṭha and Āpastamba allow all but the *cheṭa*. Bodhāyana



permits the eating of the *silurus boalis*, the fish called *chilichima* (popularly known as *vāliyā*), the *varmī*, the *maśakari*, the *rohita* (*cyprinus rohita*), and the *rājīva*. In the opinion of Manu (V. 16), the *pāṭhina* (*silurus boalis*) and the *rohita* may be eaten, if used for offering to the gods or to the *manes*, while the *rājīva* (those marked with lines), the *simhatuṇḍa* (lion-beaked) and the *saśalka* (those having fins and scales) and may be eaten on all occasions. The law-books prohibit the fishes that are misshapen. Āpastamba forbids also those which are snake-headed and those which live on flesh only. Manu's opinion is dead against eating fish by a Brahmin (V. 15). We are told: "He who eats the flesh of any animal, is called the eater of the flesh of that (particular creature), he who eats fish is an eater of every (kind of) flesh; let him therefore avoid fish."

The medical treatises of Charaka and Suśruta present the list of *bhakshya* and *abhakshya* creatures on medical grounds.

It may not be out of place to consider here the rules from the social code of the Israelites enforced by Moses and Aaron in the Book of Leviticus, xi, concerning the eating and avoiding meats. The fundamental rules to be observed are as follows:

a. Whatsoever parteth the hoof, and is clovenfooted, and cheweth the cud, among the beasts, that shall be eaten. The camel is unclean, because he cheweth the cud, but divideth not the hoof. The same as to the coney and the hare. The swine is unclean, because, though he divide the hoof, and be clovenfooted, yet he chewth not the cud.

b. Those among the creeping things that creep upon the earth shall be deemed unclean, *e. g.*, the weasel, the mouse, and the tortoise after his kind, and the ferret, the chameleon, and the lizard, and the snail and mole.

c. The eagle, the gier eagle, the ossifrage, the osprey, the vulture, the kite, the raven, the owl, the little owl, the great owl, the hawk, the night hawk, (in short, every carnivorous or rapacious bird) after his kind, the cuckoo, the cormorant, the swan, the pelican, the stork, the heron, the lapwing, the bat after his kind, and all fowls that creep, going upon all four shall be considered abominable.

d. All that have not fins and scales in the seas, and in the rivers, of all that move in the waters, and of any living thing which is in the waters shall not be eaten, and whatsoever hath fins and scales in the waters shall be eaten.

e. Every flying creeping thing that goeth upward on all four, which have legs above their feet, to leap withal upon the earth, *e. g.*, the locust, the bald locust, the beetle, and the grasshopper after his kind, shall be eaten.

The creatures allowed under the fifth rule are out of the question in the Brahmanist code. The latter code permits the meat of the hare and discards only the village pigs. The creatures disallowed under the second rule with the single exception of the tortoise, correspond to those forbidden in the Brahmanist code. The list of forbidden birds supplied under the third rule is in detail and spirit the same as in the latter code. The fourth rule, too, is in complete agree-



ment with the main trend of the Brahmanist code. It must also be noted that the rules in both the codes are motivated by the idea of things clean and unclean, abominable and unabominable. And what is more important is that in both the codes the prescriptions and prohibitions had behind them a common belief or assumption that every moving thing that liveth was meant by the Creator to serve as meat for man considered as the best of created things (Book of Genesis, ix. 2-3). Here, in India, the Chhândogya Upanishad, v. 2. 1, says: "Whatsoever is the living creature, even the horses and vultures included, shall be the meat for the foremost among the living beings". (*yat kiñchid idam āśvabhya āśa-kunibhya iti*). And Manu, too, says to the same effect (V. 28):

*prāṇasyāhnamidaṁ sarvaṁ Prajāpatir akalpayat |  
sthāvaraṁ jaṅgamaṁ chaiva sarvaṁ prāṇasya bhojanam ||*

The social code of Islam as defined in the Quran is substantially the same as that in the Old Testament despite the fact that it permits the meat of camels.

According to the Biblical cosmogony, only herbs and fruits were intended at first to be meat for men, and green herbs only were given for meat to all beasts, birds and insects. Thus the eating of fish and flesh, at first raw and subsequently cooked, came into vogue only by way of a departure from the original state of innocence and purity. The stoppage of cannibalism marked a great advance in the process of social evolution. The restriction of eating to the creatures killed at the altar built unto God, for making burnt offerings of every clean beasts and of every clean fowl was meant to check the sinful impulse of men as well as for ensuring the excellence of the quality of meat. The taking of every clean beasts by sevens, the male and his female, of every unclean beast by two, the male and his female, and of fowls also of the air by sevens, the male and his female, into the ark of Noah was to keep seed alive upon the face of all the earth,—to prevent them from becoming extinct.

The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa preserves a story of the deluge, which reads in many respects like the Biblical story. But in the Brāhmaṇa version there is nothing about the step taken to save the various species of life from extinction. Manu is the Indian patriarch during whose regime the deluge took place, and it is in Manu's code that we have this dictum, that the Creator (Prajāpati) intended the whole of the vegetable kingdom (*sthāvara*) and the whole of the animal kingdom (*jaṅgama*) to serve as meat for men. The trend of thought which runs through the story of creation narrated in the Aggañña Sutta (Dīgha-N. III) is to this effect, that men before their appearance on this earth were so many resplendent gods and dwellers of the realm of light, feeding on joy. Since their appearance on this earth they began to lose their original complexion and grew darker and darker with their mental and moral deterioration. With the gradual solidification of the earth at first low and subsequently high vegetation appeared. Neither tith nor cooking was at first necessary as the food plants yielded ready meals of rice (or barley). Other dishes of meat and



fish, prepared by means of the art of cooking, gradually developed, were by implication only an adjunct to rice or barley which continued to be the staple food with the Indians. It was so also in the Maurya Age when Megasthenes visited India. The ideal of the hermit or ascetic life was to live on gleanings from the wood and on wildgrown *nīvāra rice*, and ultimately to feed on the elemental food of air, water and fire. The country abounded with the worship of the Yakshas and Nāgas, the blood-thirsty demigods who needed appeasement with human and animal sacrifices. The Valāhassa Jātakas associates the practice of cannibalism with the *rākshasas* of South India and Ceylon. But even apart from aboriginal contact, secular Brahmanism felt the need of sacrificial slaughter of animals and continued to justify it in spite of the acceptance of the principle of *ahiṃsā*. The Nigrodhamiga Jātaka goes to show that the sacrificial post or execution block was introduced as a practical device to kill select creatures out of sight of their kins, preventing panic and unnecessary killing. Besides being a restrictive measure, the sacrificial slaughter was a means of purifying man's motive in killing. The followers of Pārśva, the Ājīvikas and the Nirgranthas were extremists as regards the cult of *ahiṃsā*, and their views and sentiments were shared by the *Bhikshus*, *Sannyāsins* or *Parivrajakas* of other orders. The rulers of the land respected their feelings when they provided for the *dhammika-rakkhāvaranagutti* (protection of trees and creatures in the sanctified area of their abodes). The Buddha saw the difficulty of avoiding killing or being somehow or other the agent of killing while living (Upāli-Sutta, Majjhima-N. II). So he laid stress on the mental side of the act,—the presence or absence of the motive (*chetanā*). He banned trades in meat, fish and live-stocks on the part of his lay followers by way of restrictive measures and condemned the slaughter of life in the name of sacrifice. The state-protection of all creatures in forest reserves (P. E. V) must have been intended for the preservation of the species. Kauṭilya's rule (Arthaśāstra, II. 16), that one-sixth of live animals, such as birds and beasts, shall be let off in forest under state protection, was to the same effect.

From the qualifying clause, "that neither come into (men's) use, nor are eaten", Aśoka's purpose seems to have been to stop for good the unnecessary killing or torture of inoffensive creatures, not because they were *maṅgalyas* or *sacrosancts*. The abandonment of the practice of going on hunting expedition on his part must have been in accordance with the dictates of his new religious conscience. His intention of minimising the slaughter of and infliction of cruelty on living beings which is clearly expressed in R. E. I is perceptible also behind all the restrictive measures contemplated in his Regulation of Piety.

When he said, "nor are eaten", he must have kept in his mind the customary food of the *śiṣṭas* or culured folk of the Middle Country of his time of which the limited Āryāvarta of Bodhāyana and Vasishṭha or the Middle Country of Manu (ii. 21) was just the western part. And by *śiṣṭas* one must understand the twice-born or men of three upper grades of Hindu society. The Brah-



min law-givers' rules, though primarily intended for the Brahmins, were equally applicable to the *Kshatriyas* and *Vaiśyas*. When Buddhaghosa said that the flesh of peafowls and the like (*moramamsādini*) was much liked by the people of the Middle Country, he meant that it was relished by all sections of the people of that part of India. When elsewhere he spoke of *mora-tittirādayo* ( the peafowl, the partridge, and the like), he must have meant the five species of birds, the *tittira*, the *kapota*, the *kapiñjala*, the *vārdhrāṇasa* and the *mayūra*, eaten by the people of *Madhyadeśa* and recommended by Bodhāyana and Vasishṭha. The fact of liking for peafowls finds corroboration, as noted before, in R. E. I.

We cannot say with Bhandarkar that Aśoka put an embargo also on tortoises other than *dulī* and porcupines.

22. *ajakā nāni eḍakā cha sukalī cha gabhinī va pāyamīnā va avadhiya potake cha kāni āsamāsike* : This indicates that goats, rams and pigs among village or domestic animals were eaten by the people of the Middle Country and of India, the first two by the *śiṣṭas* in accordance with the injunction of the law-books. The village pigs stand condemned in the law-books, but Pali Canonical accounts of *yajñas* expressly include pigs (*sūkarā*) among the animals usually sacrificed by the kings and Brahmins. Aśoka's Regulation was meant to restrain the people of India against the killing of she-goats, ewes, and sows, if they were found to be with young or in milk, as also against the killing of their offspring, if they were within six months of age.

Among the *Smṛitikāras*, Gautama alone, as pointed out by Bühler, forbids the meat of animals whose teeth have not fallen away. Kauṭilya (*Arthaśāstra*, II. 26) "generally forbids under penalty the killing of the calf, the bull, and the milch-cow" (*vatso vṛiṣho dhenuś chaisām avadhyāḥ*, quoted by Mookerji). As for checking the killing of animal females with young, the *Nigrodhamiga Jātaka* presents a story in which a doe desiring to put off her turn of going into the execution-block, pleads her case, saying, "Sire, I am now with young (*gabbhinī*), after giving birth to offspring we both will take our turn, be pleased to shift the turn." Taking her turn upon himself, a noble-minded deer-king went to the execution-block and waited for the doom, although he was granted the boon of life. Amazed by this noble example of self-sacrifice, the ruler of the land granted forthwith the boon of protection (*abhayaṃ*) also to the doe with young. And Kauṭilya (*Arthaśāstra*, XIII. 5) lays down that the king in a conquered territory should on certain specified days prohibit the slaughter of animal females and young ones.

There is not a word about the cow and her calf in the edict in this particular connection. The oxen (*gone*) certainly find mention alongside of goats, rams and pigs in the context of the rule for branding. Following the custom of the Middle Country, Bodhāyana and Vasishṭha prohibited the meat of milch-cows and oxen. Kauṭilya penalised the killing of the calf, the bull, and the



milch-cow. The Buddha raised his strong voice against the killing of cows (Brāhmaṇa-dhammika Sutta, Sutta-nipāta), and succeeded in persuading some of the contemporary rulers and leading Brahmin teachers of the Middle Country to put a stop to the practice. The killing of milch-cows, oxen, and calves must have been out of the question in the Middle Country of Aśoka's time. But if going by Bühler's interpretation of *saṃdāka*, we say that Aśoka put an embargo only on the bulls set at liberty, it will follow that he left milch-cows, cows with young, calves and other oxen to their miserable fate, which, however, does not seem probable.

23. *tīsu chātummāsīsu* : "on the three *chāturmāsīs* (i. e., on the full-moon day which falls before (or after) the usual season of four months" (Mookerji). This is not correct. We cannot say "before", because by the accepted definition of the term, *chāturmāsī* means the first full-moon day at the end of a four-monthly season, which is to say with Bhandarkar (Aśoka, p. 350), "the full-moon of the initial month of each season." In reference to Pāṇini's aphorism, V. I. 94, Paṭaṅjali (quoted by Bühler) defines the term thus: *chaturshu māsesu bhavā chāturmāsī paurṇamāsī*, "the full-moon day which falls after a period of four months is called *chāturmāsī*". The Kāśikā rightly suggests: *chāturmāsī pūrṇamāyāh nāma Āshāḍhī Kārttikī Phālgunī*, according to which there are only three such full-moon days, one which occurs in Āshāḍha, the initial month of the rainy season (*varshā-ritu*), one which occurs in Kārttika, the initial month of the cold season (*hemanta*), and the third which occurs in Phālguna, the initial month of the hot season (*grīshma*). Bühler has aptly quoted Buddhaghosa's comment on the Pali expression *Komudī chātummāsīni* to show that the full-moon of Kārttika marked the end of a season, the rainy season of four months (Sumaṅgala-vilāsinī, I, p. 130; Papanācha-sūdanī on Majjhima-N. III, Ānāpānasati Sutta). According to Buddhaghosa, the expression *pachchhima-kattika-chātummāsa-puṇṇamāsā*; *chatunnam vassikānam māsānam pariyoṣānattā chātummāsīni vuchchatī*, i. e., the full-moon which falls in the month of Kārttika; it is called *chātummāsīni* because of its occurrence after the termination of four months of the rainy season. Here Buddhaghosa is concerned only with one *chāturmāsī*. In view of all these facts, Mookerji should not have remarked that "it is not clear which full moons are meant in this edict, whether those of Phālguna, Āshāḍha and Kārttika, or of the other series, or whether those at the beginning or the end of the seasons" (Aśoka, p. 183). Aśoka's expression *tīsu chātummāsīsu* cannot but mean the three full-moon days that occurred in Āshāḍha, Kārttika and Phālguna, at the end of the three four-monthly seasons and were observed in the Middle Country as holidays.

24. *Tisāyam puṇṇamāsīyam* : "on the Tishya full-moon day". This is what is called the Taisha *paurṇamāsī* (Gobhila Gṛihya-Sūtra, III. 10. 18) which must



be taken to mean nothing but the full-moon day in the month of Pausha (*Paushī māse tu yatra sã, Amarakosha, Svargavarga*).

25. *tiṁni divasāni* : The three days are enumerated as *chāvudasaṁ pañna-*  
*dasam paṭipadam*.

26. *chāvudasaṁ pañnadasaṁ paṭipadam* : "the fourteenth day, the fifteenth day, the first day (of a lunar half-mnth)." In commenting on the Pali expression, *chātuddasī pañchadasī aṭṭhamī cha pakkhassa* (*Bhayabherava Sutta, Majjhima-N I*), Buddhaghosa points out that here the word *pakkhassa*, "of the *paksha*", is to be connected with all the three terms. The term *paksha* which is generally translated by "a lunar fortnight" really means the whole period of a particular phase of the moon. As the phase is either bright or dark, there are two *pakshas*, the *śukla* and the *krishṇa*. Each of these two phases is gone through in fourteen days, if the fifteenth day which marks the end or culmination of a *paksha* is ignored, and in fifteen days, if the fifteenth day is not ignored. According to Indian astronomy, the *pañchadasī* or fifteenth day of a lunar phase is either the full-moon or the new-moon day (*pakshāntau pañchadaśyau dve, Amarakosha, Svargavarga, dve paurṇamāsyamāvāsyē, Tīkā*). If the word *paksha* be taken in the sense of fortnight, we cannot justify the Pali expression, *pakkhassa pañchadasī*, "the fifteenth day of a lunar *paksha*." According to the *Arthaśāstra* (II. 20), *paksha* stands for 'a lunar half month.' During the *śukla-paksha* or bright period of a lunar phase the moon waxes day by day until the maximum of waxing (*chanda-pāripurī, chandrasya pūrṇatā*) is reached on the fourteenth or the fifteenth day. And during the *krishṇapaksha* or dark period of a lunar phase the moon wanes day by day until the maximum of waning (*chandakkaya*) is reached on the fourteenth day. The *pūrṇimā* or *paurṇamāsī* (full-moon) is the culminating point of the bright phase, and the *darśa* or *amāvasyā*, that of the dark phase. The *pūrṇimā* is the occasion when the moon is full and at the greatest distance from the sun (*Gobhila Gṛihya-sūtra, I. 5. 7*). The *amāvasyā* is the occasion when sun and moon are in conjunction (*amāvasyā darśah sūryendu-saṅgamah, Amarakosha, Svargavarga*), —when their approach to each other is the nearest (*sūryachandramasor yah paraḥ sannikarśah sāmā-vasyā, Gobhila, I. 5. 7*). Thus each of these two is the event of a moment, after which the moon begins to decrease or to increase. The moment, however, is not without a duration, which varies from time to time. The *pratipada* or first day of every new phase commences from the end of this duration and lasts for a lunar day, and the *aṣṭamī* is the eighth day counted from the *pratipada* in either of the two phases.

Scientific opinion and common knowledge and superstition combined in Ancient India to attach much importance to the fourteenth, fifteenth and eighth days of lunar phases as *tithis* for the observance of *upavasatha* or *uposatha* (fast and abstinence) and the performance of sacrifices and other religious duties. In ancient Hindu belief the new-moon day was best suited for oblations to the



manes (*pitris*), and the full-moon day for oblations to the gods (*devas*). In the word of the Buddha these were the three lunar days typical of those which were widely recognised and noteworthy (*abhiññātā abhilakkhitā*, Bhayabherava Sutta, Majjhima-N. I). Widely recognised, because of their connection with the periodically recurring phenomena of waxing and waning of the moon (*abhiññātā ti chandapāripurīyā chandakkhayena*), and noteworthy because of the observance of fast and abstinence, the hearing of religious discourses, and the performance of the acts of worship and homage (*upōsathamādāna-dhammassavaṇa-pūjāsakkārādi-karaṇattham lakkkhetabbā*, Buddhaghosa). And these were the special days on which the masses of people paid worship and made offerings at various shrines and sacred even to such blood-thirsty and powerful demigods as the Yakshas, Rākshasas and Piśāchas. To the Buddhist laity, too, the three *tithis* were days for the observance of fast and abstinence, while the eighth day was particularly important, as will be shown anon, as the *tithi* for congregating at a *vihāra* or monastic establishment of the *bhikshus* and *bhikshunis*. The question is—how did the *pratipada* come into importance as a *tithi* in this very connexion? The answer to this is not, however, far to seek.

First, according to the Pali scholiast Buddhaghosa, the Buddhist laity observed the *uposatha* (*uposatham upavasanti*) either on the previous day, anticipating the recognised *tithi* (*pachchugachchhantā*), or on the subsequent day, following the recognised *tithi* (*anugachchhantā*). Accordingly in the case of the *chātuddasī-uposatha*, the religious vows might be taken either on the thirteenth or the fifteenth day, in the case of the *pañchadasī-uposatha*, the vows might be taken either on the fourteenth or the first day of the new lunar phase (*pātipade uposathikā honti*, Manoratha-pūraṇī to Aṅguttara-N., Tikani-pāta, Devadūtavagga; also Sāratthappakāsinī to Yakkhasamyutta, 4).

Secondly, according to the general rule laid down by Gobhila (Gṛihyasūtra, I. 5. 5), the ends of the half-months are the time for fasting (*upavāsa*), the beginnings for sacrifice (*yajñā*). The ends are represented by the full-moon and new-moon days. If either the full moon or the new-moon occurs on the fourteenth day or in the forenoon of the fifteenth day of the lunar half-month, the fourteenth day is to be observed as a fast-day, and the fifteenth as the day of sacrifice. If any one of the two occurs in the afternoon, the evening, or the twilight of the fifteenth day, this very day is to be observed as a fast-day, and the next-day, *i. e.*, the *pratipada*, as the day of sacrifice (Gobhila Gṛihya-pūtra, I. 5. 1-13; Āpastamba's Yajñaparibhāṣā-sūtras, 63 70). According to the Vājasaneyas, if the full-moon occurs in the twelfth part of the night or even in the forenoon of the sixteenth day, fasting is to take place on this very day, *i. e.*, on the *pratipada*. According to the Kaushītaka Brāhmaṇa, III. 1, if the full-moon occurs at the twilight of any day, the following day, *i. e.*, the *pratipada*, is to be observed as the fast-day. The day on which the moon is not seen is to be observed as a fast-day, considering it as the new-moon day.



26. *dhuvāye cha anuposatham* : The same as to say *anuposatham cha dhuvāye* in the Sārnāth copy of the Schism Pillar Edict, "as well as on all fasting days as a rule" (Mookerjee), "and invariably on fast days" (Bhandarkar). Both of them have sadly missed the sense and force of this clause in common with other previous scholars, failing to recognise *anuposatha* as a Pali technical term occurring in the Vinaya Mahāvagga, II. 4. 36 : *anuposathe uposatho na kātabbo aññatra sangha-sāmaggiyā*, "the *uposatha* function is not to be undertaken on the non-*uposatha* day except for testing the unity of the Saṅgha", the *uposatha-kammam* being identified with *Pātimokkhuddesam* (the recital of the Pātimokkha rules). Buddhaghosa rightly defines the term *anuposatha* as the day other than the fourteenth and fifteenth days of lunar phases (*anuposathe ti chātuddasiko cha pañnarasiko chāti—ime dve uposathe thapetvā aññasmim divase*). The only other day mentioned in the Vinaya text is the *aṭṭhami* or eighth day of a lunar phase. Formerly the Buddhist Fraternity used to recite the Pātimokkha rules on the three days of lunar half month but subsequently the rule was modified with the result that the eighth day function was dispensed with (*na pakkhassa tikkhattum Pātimokkham uddisitabbam, anujānāmi sakim pakkhassa chātuddase vā pañnarase vā Pātimokkham uddisitum*). The general usage with other religious orders was to congregate on the fourteenth, fifteenth and eighth days of lunar half month for religious discourses, and the people among their lay supporters, too, used to come to them for hearing religious discourse on those very days. Since the introduction of the same rule into the Buddhist Order its members began to congregate on the self-same three days, and its lay supporters, too, began to approach them for the purpose of *dhamma-saṇa*. Therafter it was found inconvenient and inexpedient to recite the Pātimokkha rules on the eighth day, and to attend to lay visitors on the other two *uposatha* days as on those two days the *bhikshus* and *bhikshunis* were to be mindful of themselves exclusively. Not that the laity were prevented from coming to a monastery for the purpose of *dharma-sraṇa* on the other two days, if they so desired, but they would come only to interfere with the private business of the Fraternity. Thus they must have found the eighth day to be a most convenient day for congregation at a local monastery. And this fact is well stressed by Aśoka's clause *dhuvāye cha anuposatham*, "and invariably on the non-*uposatha* day", non-*uposatha* from the point of view of the Saṅgha.

Buddhaghosa informs us that since the Master's demise the leading *Theras* of the Buddhist Order fixed the fifth day as an additional day for religious discourses with a view to shortening the long interval between the days originally set apart for the purpose, and thenceforth the fifth day came to be recognised (*parinibbute pana dhamma-saṅgāhakā therā chintesum, "dhammasaṇam chirena hoti" ti tato sammannitvā pañchamīti dhammasaṇa-divasam thapesum; tato pabhūti sā abhīlakkhitā jātā*, Papañcha-sūdanī, I, Bhayabherva-suttavaṇṇanā). But the Sārnāth copy of Aśoka's Schism Pillar Edict bears a clear



testimony to the eighth day continuing to be the non-uposatha day specially set apart for the laity (*te pi cha upāsakā anuposatham yāvu, anuposatham cha dhuvāye ikike mahāmāte posathāye yāti*). Even Aśoka's statement in this Schism Pillar Edict goes so far as to distinguish between the two terms, *uposatha* and *posatha*, the first being applicable to the duties of the Fraternity on the fourteenth and fifteenth days, and the second to those of the laity on the non-uposatha days. The correspondence between the *anuposatha* day and the eighth day may be deduced also from the fact that in the statement in P. E. V, where the expression *anuposatha* occurs, there *aṭhami* is absent, and in the statement where the expression *aṭhami* occurs in conjunction with *chāvudasa* and *pāmnadasa*, there *anuposatha* is absent.

27. *etāni yeva divasāni* : "on all these days". The question is—on how many days in the year? Bühler counts them as fifty-six in all, "made up of (1) six in each of the months beginning with a season, and in Pausha, viz., the eighth of each fortnight, the full-moon days with those preceding and following them, and new-moon days, totalling  $6 \times 4 = 24$ ; (2) four in the remaining eight months, viz., the full and new moon days, and the eighth of each fortnight, totalling thirty-two days." After representing the opinion thus of Bühler, Mookerji (Asoka, p. 183 f.) adds: "In specifying these days for practice of abstention, Asoka only followed the popular Brahmanical practice which held the four days of the changes of the moon as sacred sabbath days, called *Parvan*. On the two chief *Parvans*, the full and new-moon days, there were fasting and sacrifices. The *Parvan* days were to be marked by continence, worship, prayer, and abstention from violence even to plants [cf. "Let him not cut even a blade of grass," *Vishnu*, lxxi. 87. cited by Bühler], and observed as holidays in the Brahmanical schools [Manu, iv. 1113-1114]. Thus in fixing their *Upasatha* days, the Buddhist and Jains only took over the Brahmanical usages. Asoka also in this Edict shows respect for them. Besides the four *Parvan* days, the three *Chāturmāsī* full-moons were also holidays for Brahmans when sacrifices were performed and studies suspended. As regards the three days at full moon in *Pausha* or *Taisha*, Asoka makes them sacred probably for their connection with the *Uttarāyana*, a great popular festival to this day. Regarding these prohibitions, it is curious to note that they follow the lines laid down by Kauṭilya (XIII. 5): 'the king [in a conquered territory] should prohibit the slaughter of animals for half a month during the period of *Chāturmāsya* (from July to September), for four nights on the full-moon days, and for a night to mark the date of his birth, or celebrate the anniversary of his conquest. He should also prohibit the slaughter of females and young ones as well as castration.'

The fish and other creatures got relief for not less than seventy two days in the year, calculated at the rate of 3 days in every lunar half-month, viz., the first, the eighth, and the full-or new-moon. The three *Chāturmāsī* and *Taisha* full-



moon days are all included in the list of full-moon days throughout the year. It is not enough to say with Mookerji that the popular Brahmanical usages were taken over by the Buddhists and Jains; we should say that these were taken over and appreciably modified. Instead of citing Vishṇu and Kauṭilya to show that Aśoka followed the lines laid down by them, one should try to understand how far the changes in Brahmanical usages were due to modification effected by Asoka with an inspiration from the Buddhists and Jains. Further, Kauṭilya's object was only to suggest the effective way of impressing the people of a conquered territory with the feigned righteousness of the victor.

28. *nāgavansi kevaṭabhogasi*: The *nāgavana* or elephant-forest must have been typical of what Kauṭilya calls forests under state-protection (*abhayāranya*, Arthaśāstra, II. 26), which is to say, reserve-forests. That these forests contained also lakes, pools and streams as places for fishes is evident from Kauṭilya's rule prohibiting the killing of fish, elephants, ferocious beasts, etc. Mookerji rightly explains the second term as meaning 'particular places of water reserved by, and for, fishermen for their own *bhoga*' (Asoka, p. 184). According to Aśoka's statement, in these places aquatic beings other than fish, too, were caught or killed. And these other beings were meant by Aśoka's expression *amṇāni jīvanikāyani*.

29. *aṭhamir pakhāye*: "on the eighth (*tithi*) of every fortnight" (Mookerji); "on the eighth of each fortnight" (Bhandarkar). Thus they treat it as the same expression as the Pali *aṭṭhamī pakkhassa*. But what about *chāturmāsī-pakhāye* occurring almost in the same context? It cannot surely be taken to mean "on the *Chāturmāsī* of each fortnight." In Aśoka's expression the emphasis is laid on *pakkha*, and not on *aṭṭhamī*. I shall not be surprised if by *aṭhamipakhāye* was meant the fortnight connected with a special *ashtamī*. If this eighth day was no other than what is called *ashtakā* in the Gṛihya-sūtras, as it seems very likely, Aśoka must have meant by *aṭhamipakhāye* "during the dark fortnight containing an *ashtakā*. The *ashtakās* were generally counted as three and by some authorities as four, the eighth day of the dark fortnight in each of the four winter months (Gobhila Gṛihya-sūtra, III. 10. 1-8).

30. *Tisāye Punāvasune*: "under the Tishyā and Punarvasu asterisms"; "on the Tishya and Punarvasu days". The Tishya days are the days on which the moon in her monthly course is in conjunction with the Tishyā nakshatra situated entirely within the Cancer. The Punarvasu days are the days on which the moon in her monthly course is in conjunction with the Punarvasu nakshatra forming a group of five stars, four situated within the Gemini and one within the Cancer. These two *nakshatras* find mention successively in two contexts, the first of castration and the second of branding oxen, goats, rams and boars.



Among the special days on which Kauṭilya prohibits castration and branding (Arthaśāstra, XIII. 5), are included the day of the birth-star of the conqueror or of the national star (*i. e.*, the star of the conquest itself). As regards the release of prisoners which is also a subject-matter of the present edict, Kauṭilya (Arthaśāstra, II. 36) prescribes the day of the king's birth-star and that of the acquisition of a new territory among proper occasions. As Aśoka specifies only a regnal year in connexion with each jail delivery, one may say that we need not here be concerned with the stars associated with other occasions mentioned by Kauṭilya. But the star of coronation cannot be less important to a reigning king than his birth-star, especially to Aśoka who has dated all of his important deeds in terms of a year of his coronation. In accounting for his predilections for the two *nakshatras*, Tishyā and Punarvasu, Bhandarkar has claimed the former and Bühler the latter as the birth star of Aśoka. But each of them has left one star unexplained.

The Tishya alone finds mention in the two special edicts promulgated in the conquered territory of Kalinga. Here it must be either Aśoka's birth-star or that of the conquest of Kalinga. When the name of the Tishya is repeated in P. E. V. which has nothing to do with Kalinga, we may establish by elimination that it is the birth-star of Aśoka, in which case the Punarvasu must pass as the star of his *abhisheka*. To suggest that the Tishya was the conquest-star will be to go against the spirit of his *dharmma-vijaya*. Aśoka was discreet enough not to remind the people of Kalinga of its conquest by the Maurya army.

31. *sudivasāye* : "at festivals" (Mookerji) ; "on such auspicious days" (Bhandarkar). I prefer the second rendering. The *tithis* mentioned in the context typify only the *sudivasā*, but they do not exhaust the list. The significance of *sudivasāye* may be easily realised from the Pali sentence : *ajja sunakkhattam, sumuhuttam sudivasam sumangalam* (*ante*, p. 142). "To-day (we have) an auspicious moment, an auspicious day, an auspicious portent."

32. *chāturmāsīye chāturmāsi-pakhāye* : "on the full-moon days of the seasons and during the fortnights connected with the seasonal full-moon" (Mookerji); "on the *chāturmāsīs* and during the fortnights connected with the *chāturmāsīs*" (Bhandarkar). This interpretation may be allowed to stand. But there is another, and perhaps a better, interpretation possible. Through the three successive statements concerning the auspicious days we notice a process of gradually narrowing them down. In the third context the expression, *tisu chāturmāsīsu* (a 7th case, plural) by *chāturmāsīye* (a first, second, or fourth case, singular). Even as a fourth case singular, *chāturmāsīye* means during the continuance of the full-moon of a four-monthly season, may be a particular season, say, the rainy. As a first or second case singular, *chāturmāsīye* may be equated



with the Sk. *chāturmāsyaḥ* or *chāturmāsyam*, "during the period of the *chātur-māsya* (July-Sept.)". And *chāturmmāsi-pakkha*, too, seems to correspond to Kauṭilya's *chāturmāsyeshu ardharātrikam* and to what is called *pāṭihāriya-pakkha* in Pali (Aṅguttara—N. I, p. 144f.). Kauṭilya (Arthaśāstra), as we saw, prohibits the branding of animals "for half a month during the period of *chāturmāsya* (from July to September), for four nights during the full moon, and for a night on the day of birth-star of the conqueror or of the national star" (*rāja-deśa-nakshareshu*), which well accords with Aśoka's third statement. Buddhaghosa defines the term *pāṭihāriya-pakkha* as being either the whole period of three months within the Buddhist Lent (*antovasse temāsam*), or the period of one month between the two *pavāranas*, or at least half a month from the first *pavāraṇā* (*paṭhama-pavāraṇāto paṭṭhāya eko aḍḍhamāso pāṭihāriya-pakkho yeva nāma*), the *pavāraṇā* taking place on the full-moon day of Āshāḍha or Śrāvaṇa.

33. *etāya aṃtalikāye paṃnavīsati baṃdhanamokhāni kaṭāni*: This statement is made with reference to the twenty-sixth year of Aśoka's *abhisheka*. Aśoka effected twenty-five jail-deliveries, evidently once in every regnal year. In R. E. V, Aśoka speaks of occasional liberations of prisoners by the *Dharmamahāmātras* on grounds of age, maintenance of family, good conduct, and payment of ransom. According to Kauṭilya, too, (Arthaśāstra, II. 36, XIII. 5) the prisoners to be liberated were to be from "the juvenile, aged, diseased, and helpless, *bāla-vṛiddha vyādhita-anāthānam*" (Mookerji, Asoka, p. 185). But here Aśoka seems to have spoken of general liberations, effected once a year, or on the whole, preferably the former. The question is—When was it done, on the birth-day anniversary or the anniversary of the day of *abhisheka*? According to V. A. Smith, 'probably to celebrate the king's birthday' (Asoka, 3rd ed., p. 207). The decision of the point at issue depends largely on the ascertainment of Aśoka's method of reckoning his regnal years. In Mookerji's opinion, "The twenty-sixth year [in which P. E. V is engraved] is thus the current year, and not the year that has expired, since up to this time there have been only twenty-five liberations of prisoners. Thus we may take it as a general rule that all years mentioned in the Edicts are the current years of the reign of Asoka" (Asoka, p. 184). If it be assumed that his system was to keep the statement ready with the year ending and to release it for publicity in the next regnal year, possibly on the New year day, we cannot preclude the possibility of the liberation of prisoners to celebrate the anniversary of his *abhisheka*.



As to P. E. VII :—

1. *dhammasāvanāni sāvāpitāni, dhammasāvane kaṭe* : The *dhammasāvana* or 'proclamation of piety' was the first of the twofold means contrived by Aśoka for the promotion of the cause of piety among his subjects and other peoples. But here are apparently two contradictory statements : in the first he speaks of the proclamations in the plural, and in the second of the proclamation in the singular. The Minor Rock Edict is the only recorded instance of proclamations of piety: *iyam sāvane sāvāpīte, sāvane kaṭe*. Is it that in reference to this he made the second statement? There is no better explanation to offer for the discrepancy between the two. The putting of *dhamma-sāvana* in the singular is deliberate. It is preceded by two other clauses in which *dhamma-thaṃbhāni* and *dhamma-mahāmātā* are each put in the plural, and the clauses themselves are statements in reference to previously recorded facts: *dhamma-thaṃbhāni kaṭāni, dhammamahāmātā kaṭā*. Evidently what Aśoka wanted to say is that although several happy messages of piety were publicly proclaimed, only one of them, namely, that in M. R. E., was caused to be engraved prior at least to the promulgation of P. E. VII.

2. *dhamma sāvanāni, dhammānusathini* : Each of these two terms is connected with a cognate verb, the first with *sāvāpayāmi, sāvāpitāni*, and the second with *anusāsāmi, ānapitāni*. Technically, a *dhammasāvana* is a proclamation, and a *dhammānusathi*, Sk. *dharmānuśisṭhi* a command, an instruction concerning the Law of Piety or Duty. A *dhammalipi* is an engraved and properly edited form of a record of piety. Both a *dhammasāvana* and a *dhammānusathi* may be presented in the form of a *dhammalipi*. From the contents, it is in a few instances very difficult to draw a line of demarcation between one record and another. R. E. I combines both the elements. R. E. II reads like a *dhammasāvana*. R. E. III contains a piece of *dhammānusathi* in the framework of a *dhammaniyama*. R. E. IV may be supposed to have been an effective form of a *dhammasāvana*. R. E. V appears to be a combination of three elements : *dhammānusathi, dhammaniyama*, and *dhammasāvana*. In R. E. VI we have an amalgam of a *dhammaniyama* and a *dhammasāvana*. R. E. VII may stand as an example of *dhammānusathi* in common with R. E. IX, R. E. XI, R. E. X, R. E. XII, S. R. E. I, P. E. I, P. E. II, and P. E. III. R. E. VIII may serve the purpose of a *dhammasāvana*. The same holds true of R. E. XIII. P. E. IV read like a *dhammaniyama*. P. E. V is typically a piece of *dhamma-niyama*. P. E. VII is well-suited for a *dhammasāvana*. And yet all these are not described as *dhammasāvanas*. To pass as a *dhammasāvana*, the message of an edict must have to be proclaimed throughout Aśoka's empire, and even among the 'frontagers', by the employment of means mentioned in M. R. E., Yerraguḍi copy. And as for the distinction between a *dhammānusathi* and a *dhammaniyama*, see the note on *dhammaniyamāni*.



3. *dhammathambhāni* : In P. E. VII alone we have three instances of neuter plural forms of masculine and feminine stems, *e. g.*, *dhammathambhāni*, *dhammaniyamāni*, and *dhammānusathini*. Such forms in Eastern dialects in the case of Accusative plural, *e. g.*, *yutāni* (R. E. III), *pulisāni* (P. E. IV), *dhammānu-sathini anusāsāmi* (P. E. VII) are familiar. The irregular forms thus instanced are met with in clauses that are in Passive Voice. With Bühler the *dhammathambhas* are the monoliths bearing the seven Pillar Edicts. But Bhandarkar agrees with me in thinking that here *dhammathambhāni* or 'pillars of piety' stand only for the monumental acts of piety, such as those recorded in P. E. VII, R. E. II, and Queen's Edict. Aśoka, however, did not attach much importance to them, and yet he accomplished them just to keep up the ancient tradition of piety (*dhammānupaṭipati*).

4. *dhammāpadānathāye* : In commenting on the word *saddhāpadānesu* at Aṅguttara-N., V, p. 337, Buddhaghosa paraphrases *apadāna* by *lakkhaṇa* (*apadānesu lakkhaṇesu*). Accordingly Aśoka's expression may be taken to mean 'for defining the Law of Piety or Duty', 'for the edification of the principles of piety'.

5. *Bābhanesu Ājīvikesu* : "the Brahmans and Jains" (V. A. Smith); "the Brāhmaṇas (and) Ājīvikas" (Hultzsch); "the Brahmanic Ājīvikas" (Bhandarkar). From Aśoka's combination of the two words in one statement, Bhandarkar is led to presume the existence of two divisions of the Ājīvikas, Brahminical and non-Brahminical, the eaters and non-eaters of fish and that all for the want of the conjunction *cha* between the two words, or of the particle *pi* after *Bābhanesu*. Against his interpretation, I may point out : First, that nowhere in Indian literature we come across the expression *Brāhmaṇājīvika*. Secondly, that in the Paramattha-jotika, II, p. 372 f., the Brāhmaṇā as householder Brahmin teachers are distinguished from the Ājīvakā and Niggaṇṭhā as *pabbajitas*. Thirdly, that in the Arthaśāstra, III, 20, the Śākyas (Buddhists), Ājīvakas, and the like have been stigmatized as *Vṛishalapravrajitas*, not implying thereby that they were all Vṛishalas or Sūdras by caste but that they freely admitted even the Vṛishals into their orders (cf. Paramatthajotikā, II, p. 175). Fourthly, while introducing Aśoka's father Bindusāra as a votary of the Brahmins (*Brāhmaṇa-bhatta*), the Samantapāsādikā describes him as a lay supporter of the Brahmins as householders and the white-bodied (ash-besmeared) Parivrājakas and such other Brahmanical ascetics (*Brāhmaṇānaṃ cha Brāhmaṇajātiya-pāsaṇḍānaṃ cha Paṇḍaraṅgaparibbājakādīnaṃ*). A little below, in connexion with Aśoka, it offers a list to distinguish the Ājīvakas and Niggaṇṭhas (Jains) as *pravrajitas* from the typical Brahmanical ascetics (*Paṇḍaraṅgaparibbājaka-Ājīvaka-Niggaṇṭhādīyo*). Fifthly, in the Nāgārjuni Hill-cave Inscriptions the Ājīvikas are



honoured with the epithet *Bhadanta* befitting the *śratmaṇas* as distinguished from the Brahmanical ascetics. Sixthly, that, after all, we are depending here only on one version of P. E. VII and it is not impossible that two statements have been combined by mistake into one. Seventhly, that even the absence of *cha* or *pi* does not stand in the way of construing the *Bābhana* and *Ājīvika* as names of two separate sects. Lastly, the recipients of the Barābar and Nāgārjunī Hill-caves are mentioned simply as *Ājīvikas*; had they been introduced as *Bābhanājīvikas*, it would have difficult to dispute his position. If Bhandarkar still insists on combining the two words into one and construing them so as to denote the *Brāhmaṇājīvikas* in contradistinction to their non-Brahmanical namesakes, I may just concede that thereby Aśoka meant the Brahmin professionals, which is to say, the *Brāhmaṇa-ibhiyas* of R. E. V. For the use of *ājīvika* in the sense of a householder-like *religieux*, see the *Tevijjavachchhagutta Sutta* (*Majj hima*—N., II).

6. *dhammaniyame* : "the Regulation of Piety." This is the first and less effective means by which Aśoka succeeded in promoting the cause of piety, the other and more effective means being *nijhati*. According to Aśoka, the Regulations of Piety are typified by P. E. V, R. E. I, R. E. III, R. E. V, R. E. VI, P. E. IV, S. R. E. I, S. R. E. II, and Schism Pillar Edict might also be cited as instances of the same, though not technically called *dhamma-niyama*. The Schism Pillar Edict is in substance an ordinance promulgated by the king to suppress dissensions in the Buddhist Saṅgha. Each Regulation seems to have partaken of the nature of a piece of legislation enacted by Aśoka with the tacit consent of his ministers.

7. *nijhati* : Pali *nijjhatti*, a rational method of moral persuasion, of convincing others by sound arguments based upon fact. This was successfully tried as a means of stopping the slaughter of life, of inducing the nonharming mental state, of encouraging and strengthening other virtues that conduce to piety. The setting of personal examples as in R. E. I, R. E. II, R. E. VIII, R. E. XII, P. E. VII, and two commemorative Pillar inscriptions, and the imparting of instructions in the principles of piety (*dhammānusatti*) are both comprehended by the second method of *nijhati* which was intended to enable the kingdom of righteousness to grow from within instead of being thrust from outside.

8. *bahukāni dhammaniyamāni yāni me kaṭāni* : Rhys Davids has accused Aśoka, for no fault of his, of boasting as author or maker of the Dhamma. Aśoka has nowhere claimed that proud position for himself, nor has any Indian founder of a religion done that. All that Aśoka wanted to say is that he had made a great many Regulations of Piety. One glaring example of them is offered in P. E. V; the rest are left to be inferred. The statement itself is very



significant as suggesting that the *dhamma-niyama* placed on record is only a solitary example, several other *niyamas* being left unrecorded. From the example before us, it is easy to guess that Aśoka had not remained content with merely inculcating the principles of piety in the abstract but to give a practical effect to them he brought into being various Regulations. Had all of them been recorded, we would undoubtedly have a new system of polity based upon his progressive ideas and broad outlook. And it still remains a problem for the historian to determine the influence of Aśoka's ideas and applications on the subsequent Indian treatises including the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra which is decidedly a post-Aśokan compilation.

As to Schism Pillar Edict :—

1. saṅghe samage kaṭe (Sānchī) : "the Saṅgha made united", the Saṅgha of the monks and of the nuns (Sānchī, Sārnāth). The fact that it was made united, 'whole and entire', suggests that it was erstwhile divided. So 'made united' really means 're-united'. A Saṅgha was to be taken as united so long as its members agreed on eighteen points (*aṭṭhārasahi vatthūhi*) in representing as such what was not the Doctrine of Buddhas, what was truly the Doctrine, what was not the Discipline, what was not taught and spoken, what was truly taught and spoken, what was truly ordained, what was not an offence, what was truly an offence, what was a light offence, what was a grave offence, etc. And the Saṅgha was to be taken as divided when its members disagreed on these points (Vinaya Mahāvagga, x, and Chullavagga, vii). The practical test of unity and integrity of a Saṅgha was the *uposatha*-function and other allied ecclesiastical duties jointly gone through within the same sanctified boundary, within the same monastic abode. As Mookerji (Asoka, p. 196 f.) rightly observes : "[The Vinaya] texts describe different degrees in the offences leading up to schism, as well as degrees in their punishments. The Mahāvagga (x. 1, 6, etc.), for instance, mentions in an ascending order differences among the members of a Saṅgha as 'altercation (*bhaṇḍanam*), contention (*kalaha*), discord (*viṅgaha*), quarrel (*vivāda*), division (*saṅghabheda*), disunion (*saṅgharāji*), separation (*saṅghavavatthānam*), and schism (*saṅghanānākaraṇam*) or dissolution of the Saṅgha." Again, in Chullavagga, vii. 5, disunion (*saṅgharāji*) is distinguished from schism proper (*saṅghabheda*). Disunion can happen only in smaller Saṅghas of members numbering from four to eight, while schism means a break up of a Saṅgha of more than eight members. It is caused by a difference of opinion on eighteen points. . . . . The same points are mentioned again Chullav. iv. 14. 2, as creating a *Vivāda*, but a distinction is made between *Vivāda* and *Saṅghabheda*. In a *Vivāda*, the point at issue was to be decided finally by the Saṅgha, and there the matter must rest. . . . . The intention to cause a *saṅghabheda* is absent in a *vivādādhikaraṇa*."



Aśoka boldly claims that the unity of the Saṅgha was placed on such a firm footing that it could endure for ever (Sānchī) and none could divide it again,—which is evidently a wishful thinking and an exaggeration. The Pali legend in the *Dīpavaṃsa*, *Mahāvaṃsa* and *Samanta-pāsādikā* offers us a fairly authentic account of the break-out of a schism in the Saṅgha and its suppression by Aśoka. We are told that the *uposatha*-function remained suspended for seven years in the Aśokārāma owing to the unwillingness of the *bonafide* members of the Order and inmates of the monastery to do any ecclesiastical duty with the undesirable and disruptive elements present in their midst. They were really outsiders as they belonged formerly to other orders and other schools of thought. They managed somehow or other to get into the monastery, led by the greed of gains. Party faction, unruly conduct and unwarranted expression of opinion concerning the Doctrine and the Discipline became the order of the day. To remedy this sad state of affairs king Aśoka commanded a high official to go forthwith to the monastery for settling up the dispute and causing the *uposatha*-function to be jointly gone through by the inmates. The official thus deputed misunderstood altogether the king's intention. He went straight into the monastery, acquainted its inmates with the king's order, and began to behead the *bonafide* members of the Order on their refusal to obey it. The disconcerting news mortified the king who to make amends for the mistake and set the matter right sent for Moggalīputta Tissa, the most capable Thera of the time. He "arranged an assembly of the community of *bhikkhus* in its full numbers in the Aśokārāma. He then called to him in turn (in the presence of Moggalīputta Tissa) the *bhikkhus* of the several confessions and asked them: sir, what did the Blessed One teach?" He allowed to remain those *bhikkhus* whose views tallied with the *Vibhāṅgyavāda* of the Buddha, and expelled from the Order those whose views were found to be contrary to that, after giving them white robes to wear (*setakāṇi vatthāṇi datvā upapabbājesi*). Thus disrobing and driving out the undesirable persons, the king entrusted Moggalīputta Tissa with the task of conducting the *uposatha*-function, vouchsafing state-protection. At this very assembly (*samāgama*) Moggalīputta Tissa compiled the *Kathāvatthu* embodying the various controversies as these took place then.

By the consensus of opinion the text of Aśoka's ordinance confirms the authenticity of the Pali tradition concerning the third or Pāṭaliputra Council. Strictly speaking, it throws some light on the truth behind the tradition concerning the *samāgama* or assembly of the community of *bhikkhus* which preceded the Council. The question is—Does it throw any light on the rise of the eighteen Buddhist sects or schools? The Pali tradition assigns the rise of all the eighteen sects to a period, which elapsed between the reign of Kālāśoka and that of Dharmāśoka, or, more definitely, between 100 B. E. (which is the date of the Second or Vaiśālī Council) and 200 B. E., and that of six later local sects to a subsequent period (*Mahāvaṃsa*, V. 10-13). According to Vasumitra and



others, however, among the early Buddhist sects, some arose in the 2nd, some in the third, and some in the 4th century B. E. The authenticity of the tradition concerning the First or Rājagriha Council was doubted by Oldenberg, and that of the tradition concerning the Second Council by Kern. Recent researches, however, remove the ground of their objections, and find no inconsistency in the Pali traditions (*vide* my *Bauddha-grantha-kosha*, Pt. I). The Vinaya account of the First Council does not associate it with king Ajātaśatru, nor does the account of the Second Council associate it with Kālāsoka (Chullavagga, xi-xii). The account of the Second Council stops short without caring to narrate what the Vṛjiputra bhikshus did after their defeat. The Pali Chronicles correctly state that they were not the persons to keep things lying down there but staged a walk out from the assembly and held a separate Council of thier own, more democratic in its character, to openly challenge the acclaimed position of the self-styled Arhat Sthaviras. And this gave rise to the first great sect of Schismatics called Māhāsāṅghikas or Māhāsāṅgītikas. The later sects that arose branched off either from the Sthaviras or from the Māhāsāṅghikas.

In Bhandarkar's opinion (Aśoka, p. 100), Aśoka's statement, 'the Saṅgha has been made whole and entire,' "no doubt shows that the Buddhist Church was then divided, but certainly not to such a serious extent as is implied by the Sinhalese tradition connected with the Council of Pāṭaliputra. The differences were unquestionably of small importance, such as they were when the Council of Vesāli was convened. It seems that these differences were made up, that the whole Church was again united by Aśoka, and that it continued to be so till at least the 27th year of Aśoka's reign."

The weight of this remark cannot be lessened, if one places one's reliance upon Aśoka's words taken at their face value. They seem to suggest at once that there was only one Saṅgha, one community of the *bhikshus* and *bhikshunis*. But the word Saṅgha, even as employed in two copies of the Schism Pillar Edict, is only a relative term, relative to the monks, relative to the nuns (*bhikhū-saṅghasi bhikhuni-saṅghasi*). So there might as well be Saṅghas relative to different sects. To whichever sect the *bhikshus* and *bhikshunis* had belonged, they passed as members of a Saṅgha, hence the force of Aśoka's expression *Saṅghaṭasi* in P. E. VII. The trend of the Buddhist traditions is to this effect that his personal connexion was with the Theravādins or Sthaviras. In the literature of no other sect, save and except the Sarvāstivāda, we get elaborate accounts of Aśoka and what he did for Buddhism. The majority of sects ignore him. There are some that even complain of his partiality to a particular sect.

The Kathāvatthu which the Pali tradition (earliest in Milindapañha, p. 3) connects with Moggaliputta Tissa and Aśoka's reign, holds before us the picture of a great turmoil of views and activity of thought among the Buddhist sectaries, and its internal evidence goes to prove that it was the compilation of a period



when Buddhism was still confined within the territorial limits of the Middle Country (Controversy, I. 3). Its archaic dialectical style, too, as pointed by Mr. D. L. Barua (*ante*, p. 56) has its striking parallel in R. E. IX (K, Sh, M).

I think that the bearing of the Schism Billar Edict is considerable apart from the question of Buddhist sects or schools, Aśoka's interest obviously being to stop the *bhikshus* and *bhikshuṇīs* belonging to the same community and residing within the same boundary from causing split among the inmates of a monastery, which is to say, to maintain the internal peace and order of a Saṅghārāma. The Pali legend also sets forth this as his main concern. To penalise any monk or nun for an honest expression of opinion about the Doctrine or the Discipline was to go against his own principle of religious toleration. And it was not the spirit of the Vinaya rule to lay embargo "on honest differences of opinion, on freedom of thought" (Chullavagga, vii. 5. 6; Mookerji's Asoka, p. 197).

2. *ye saṅghaṃ bhākatī bhikhu vā bhikhunī vā* : "he who will split the Saṅgha, a *bhikshu* or a *bhikshuṇī*", better to say, a Saṅgha. The verb *bhākatī*, Sk. *bhaṅkshyati*, is a future form of the root  $\sqrt{bhañj}$  (to split). The usual Pali verb in such contexts is *bhindati*, which, too, is met with in Aśoka's *bhetave*, 'to divide.' Going by Aśoka's statement, a *bhikshu* or *bhikshuṇī* might equally cause split in a Saṅgha. But as the Buddha opined (Chullavagga, VII. 5), neither a *bhikshuṇī* nor a *śikshamānā*, neither a male novice nor a female novice, neither a layman nor a laywoman divides a Saṅgha, each of them may just attempt to divide; a *bhikshu* indeed, who is under no disability, belongs to the same community, and resides within the same boundary, divides a Saṅgha. On the other hand, the Mahāvagga, III. 11. 5, admits the possibility of a schism caused by a number of *bhikshuṇīs* (*sambahulāhi bhikkhunīhi saṅgho bhinno*).

The Pātimokkha which treats the attempts at *saṅghabheda* as grave offences under the Saṅghādisesa section, mentions the following *modus operandi*: (1) tries to divide a Saṅgha at union (*samaggassa saṅghassa bhedaṃ parakkameyya*); or (2) persistently raises issues calculated to cause division (*bhedanasamvattanikaṃ vā adhikaraṇaṃ samādāya paggaḥya tiṭṭheyya*); or (3) defends or defend the action of the wrong-doer as his partisan or partisans (*tass' eva bhikkhussa anuvattakā vaggavādakā*).

3. *odātāni dusāni sanamdhāpayitu* : "causing to put on white robes", which amounts to saying, replacing yellow by white robes' before expelling. But what is the significance of white robes? In the Pali texts, the white robes are mentioned as an external mark of householders as well as of the *Titthiyas* or Heretics belonging to religious orders other than Buddhist (*ante*, p. 155): *titthiyānaṃ dhajāṃ kechi dhāressanty avadātakaṃ*, "some will put on a white garment, which is a cognisance of the *Titthiyas*." Thus expelling from the



Buddhist Order as well as monastic abodes did not necessarily mean causing a person to revert to household life. According to the Pali legend, the expression *upapabbājesi* meant causing the disruptive elements among the inmates of Aśokārāma to revert to their former Orders.

The Vinaya Mahāvagga (i. 60, 67, 69) prescribes *nāsanam*, or permanent expulsion from the Order, as the extreme penalty for schism. This penalty is distinguishable from *ukkhepanam*, or suspension or temporary excommunication, prescribed for refusal to admit or atone for the guilt or to renounce a false doctrine, (Mahāv. i. 79; Chullav. i. 25, 27), and *pabbājanam*, or temporary banishment, prescribed for causing by one's conduct scandal to the Saṅgha, both revocable on repentance (Mahāv. x. 6). Penalties varied in degree and grades according to the nature of offences leading towards *saṅghabheda*. "The first punishment inflicted on a schismatic is that of *nissāvanam*, or his temporary removal from the Saṅgha (Mahāv. x. 5, 14), during which he was subjected to *parivāsa*, or living apart, for five or ten days, and *mānatta*, or living under restraint for six days, as laid down in the Pātimokkha, Saṅghādisesa, 13. His restoration, *osāvanam*, was permitted, if the accused expressed his acknowledgement of the guilt" (Mookerji, *op. cit.* p. 1975).

The penalty of *nāsana* implies both the change of dress and change of residence which find mention in the edict instead of *nāsana*.

The promulgation of an ordinance for the suppression of schisms in the Buddhist Saṅgha is unprecedented in the Buddhist ecclesiastical history. What specially calls for notice is that the ordinance was not meant to suppress similar happenings in other religious orders. As the Pali legend suggests, the king exercised this authority with the consent of the leading men of the Saṅgha. "The Buddhist law," as Mookerji points out (Asoka, p. 199), "has its counterpart in the Brahminical law, according to which mischief-makers who tried to create or foment dissensions in the village communities and assemblies were punished by banishment," and "it was the traditional duty of the king to uphold the laws, agreements and the constitution (*samaya* or *samvit*) by which the various local bodies, groups, and communities . . . . .organised and governed themselves." Aśoka had not certainly assumed the rôle of a Head of the Buddhist Church, but the fact is undeniable that he posed himself as the Custodian and Defender of the Good Faith. Among the seven texts which he recommended for constant study and meditation by the monks, nuns, and laity, the first is a Vinaya Tract presenting a conspectus of the whole of the Vinaya Piṭaka, and the third is a Tract, which in its several sections warns the members of the Buddhist Order against future dangers.

4. *anāvāsasi āvāsaiye* : Same as to say *anāvasasi vāsāpetaviye* (Sānchi).

The ordinance was not concerned with offences leading towards *saṅghabheda* but with the actual commitment of *saṅghabheda* itself for which offence *nāsanam*



or permanent expulsion from the Order, was the penalty prescribed in the Vinaya Mahāvagga. This offence does not fall within the scope of the Pātimokkha Code. Now, the severance of one's connection with the Saṅgha means for a *bhikshu* or *bhikshuṇī* replacing yellow with white robes and leaving the Buddhist monastic abode. The instances of *anāvāsa* cited by Buddhaghosa (*ante*, p. 154) are not suited to Aśoka's context, since here we are not concerned with any lighter form of punishment by way of suspension, temporary segregation, revocable on the confession of guilt or expression of repentance.

5. *saṁsalanasi* : "in the office" (Hultsch); "in (your) office" (Bhandarkar). Bhandarkar (Aśoka, p. 380) observes : "The dictionary meanings of *saṁsaraṇa* are 'highway', 'meeting of junction' and so on, and the word in the present case most probably denotes the *katcheri* of the district town, which is both on the highway and a common place of meeting." According to the Amarakosha, the word *saṁsaraṇa* means a *ghaṇṭāpatha* or highway (Bhūmivarga, 43) : *daśadhanvantaro rājamārgaḥ* (Tikā). The same lexicon (nānārthavarga, 170) suggests also a few other synonyms that are not applicable here. In the second context, the Amarakosha-Tikā takes *saṁsaraṇa* in the sense of 'a ground adjoining a town' (*pura-samīpa-bhūmiḥ*). The word *saṁsaraṇa* occurs indeed in the Vinaya Chullavagga, (v. 3. 5), as discussed by F. W. Thomas (J. R. A. S., 1915, p. 109 f.). But in the Vinaya text it does not denote "the standardised type of the *Katcheri* structure;" here *saṁsaraṇa* as distinguished from *ugghāṭana* is used to mean 'moveable' : *saṁsaraṇa-kiṭikam*, "a moveable screen." The usual word to denote a place of meeting is *samosaraṇa* rather than *saṁsaraṇa*. So I must prefer 'the highway leading from a town' as an interpretation of *saṁsaraṇa* to 'office.' Buddhaghosa explains the word *saṁsaraṇa* (Vinaya Piṭaka, III, V.) as *abhinibbijjha-gamaniyo gata-pacchāgata-maggo*, 'a thoroughfare', 'a public road'.

6. *posathāye yāti* : "goes for the fast-day service." The Jaina texts associate *poshadha* with periodical fast (*posahovavāso*, Aupapātika Sūtra, 57). Even according to the Jātakas, to observe the *posatha* is to practice eight abstinences, including fasting after midday. In other words, there is no difference in meaning between *posatha* and *uposatha*, as commonly understood then in India. But here, in Aśoka's context, *posatha* is to be distinguished from *uposatha*. The former is to denote the fast-day service to be attended by the laity at a monastery on the eighth day of a lunar phase. The latter is to denote the two lunar fast-days utilised by the *bhikshus* and *bhikshuṇīs* for the recital of the Pātimokkha rules.

7. *koṭavishavesu* : "in fortified towns" (Mookerji, Bhandarkar). I have



preferred "in fortified areas": Mookerji (Asoka, p. 196) draws attention to some South Indian Inscriptions in which the terms *koṭṭam* and *vishaya* are used "to indicate administrative areas larger than the village (*uru*), town (*nagara* or *parru*), and *Nadū* or *Kurram*, but smaller than the *Maṇḍala* or *Rāshṭra*." In the Sārnāth text, the *koṭavishayas* stand in relation to the *āhāla* or jurisdiction proper of a Mahāmātra, probably as its frontiers,—'the jungle tracts,' according to Hultsch.

8. *vivāsāpayātha*: Same as *vivāsayātha* (Sārnāth text), *vivasetavāya* (M. R. E., Ru). As regards its interpretation, I am entirely at one with Mookerji (Asoka, p. 196). It should not be taken in any other sense than "cause to be despatched for circulation." Mookerji rightly points out that this particular order forms only a part of the general direction as to the modes of circulating the *sāsana*, or text of the ordinance, the Schism Edict proper. The direction, which is put as an appendage to the ordinance, was not meant to be engraved; it has not been engraved in two other copies that present only the text of the ordinance. We have precisely the same direction as to the mode of circulating the subject-matter or text of the proclamation (*iyam aṭhe*) in M. R. E. (Ru). But Hultsch has subsequently followed F. W. Thomas (J. R. A. S., 1915, p. 112) in the sense of "expel": "issue orders to expel (schismatic monks or nuns)", which is far from the intention of Aśoka. Read with reference to the context, the imperative *vivāsayātha* or *vivāsāpayātha* cannot but have *iyam sāsane* for its object. Kauṭilya, too, uses *vyavasyanti* in the sense of 'issuing', 'sending' (Arthasāstra, II. 10).

As to Barābar Hill cave Inscriptions:—

1. *Khalatikasi pavatasi*: The Aśokan name for the group of hills containing the four caves (*kubhā*) dedicated to the Ājīvikas is Khalatika ("Bald-headed"). This name is met with also in Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya. The Great Epic name is Gorathagiri, which occurs also in two short inscriptions, edited by Oldham. A mediæval Sanskrit inscription designates the group of hills as Pravaragiri, from which the modern name Barābar has originated.

2. *dinā Ājīvikehi*: Lit., "given to the Ājīvikas." Here, as pointed out long ago by Bühler, we have the trace of a Sanskrit Dative plural case-ending in Ājīvikehi. Thus the Ājīvikas were the recipients of the four caves excavated by Aśoka in the Barābar group, as also of the three caves subsequently dedicated by Aśoka's successor king Daśaratha in the neighbouring Nāgārjunī group of hills. The Buddhist legends of Aśoka offer us an interesting explanation for his interest in an Ājīvika. First, according to the Mahāvamsa-Ṭikā, an Ājīvika named Janasāna, (Jarasāna, Jarasoṇa) made a prediction of the glory of Aśoka, and his mother promised him great honour if it should come true, and later,



when Aśoka became king and heard the story, he received him with due honour in his palace (Malalasekera, Dict. of Pali Proper Names, I, p. 936). The Divyāvadāna (p. 370 f.) gives the credit for the prediction to Bindusāra's court-astrologer Piṅgalavatsa who is described as an *ājīva-parivrājaka* or professional wandering ascetic. Here, however, we are concerned not with the Ājīvika as an individual but with the Ājīvikas as a distinct religious sect.

The recipients of the cave-dwellings were a class of ascetics, and in the absence of the epithet *Bābhana* we cannot think with Bhandarkar that they were a sect of Brahmin ascetics (Aśoka, p. 179). In the Buddha's time the Ājīvikas or Ājīvakas passed as an order of naked ascetics (*achelakas, nagga-pabbajitas*) whose cherished Tīrthaṅkaras were Nandavachchha (Nandavatsa), Kisasaṅkicchha (Kṛṣasāṅkritya), and Makkhali Gosāla (Maskarī Gośāla, better Kauśalya). In later Buddhist works, e.g., Paramattha-jotikā II, p. 372 f., even the followers of four other Tīrthaṅkaras, Pūraṇa-Kassapa, Pakudha-Kachchāyana, Ajita-kesakambala, and Saṅjaya-Belatthaputta, came to be represented as Ājīvikas. The same is the case with the Peṭakopadesa (Dutiya-bhūmi) which broadly divides them into two classes, one adhering to the philosophical views of Makkhali Gosāla, and the other to those of other heretical teachers. Here, too, they are not distinguished as Brāhmaṇa Ājīvikas : *saṃsārena suddhi Ājīvakā chulā-sīli paññāpentī. Aññājīvakā cha sassatavādiḥ cha sīlabbatāṃ bhajanti parā-māsaṃ ti* (cited from Dr. A. Barua's edition of the Peṭakopadesa, yet unpublished, p. 51).

---



## A. ADDENDA

1. Add to note 11 under R. E. I. (*ante*, p. 227) the explanation offered by Professor Bhandarkar on the strength of the Mahābhārata story of Rantideva, discussed, *ante*, p. 302.

2. Add to note 5 under R. E. II (*ante*, p. 237 f.): Dr. Girija Prasanna Majumdar has kindly sent me the following informative note for consideration : [Corresponding to the Sanskrit *ārogyasālā* (a home for the cure of diseases) we have in Pali *gilānasālā* (a hall for the cure of diseases). The term *gilānasālā* is met with in the earliest of the Pali texts (Saṃyutta-N. IV, p. 210; Aṅguttara, III, p. 142) and it also occurs throughout later Pali literature (Visuddhimagga, p. 251). Besides *gilānasālā*, we come across *sothhisālā* as an exceptional term to denote the Indian idea of a hospital. Some of the kings of Ceylon are credited in the Pali Chronicles with the foundation of both hospitals and maternity homes. The Arthaśāstra (II. 4) expressly recommends the construction of *bhaishajyagriha* (yet another term for a hospital) at the north-west corner of the compound of a fort. The same Arthasāstra refers even to an organisation similar to, if not the same as, the modern Red Cross Society. The passage in question (x. 3) runs thus : *chikitsakāḥ śāstra-yantrāgada-sneha-vastra-hastāḥ striyaśchānuapāna-rakshīṇy uddharshanīyaḥ prīṣṭhataś tishṭheyuḥ*. "The physicians with surgical instruments, machines, remedial oils and bandages in their hands, and women (nurses) in charge of food and beverage must remain standing behind men."

Fa Hien (Beal, Buddhist Records, I, p. lvii), while speaking of Pāṭaliputra, says : "The nobles and householders of this country have founded hospitals within the city to which the poor of all countries, the destitute, cripples, and the diseased may repair. They receive every kind of requisite help gratuitously, Physicians inspect their diseases, and according to their cases, order them food and drink, medicine or decoctions, everything in fact that may contribute to their ease. When cured they depart at their convenience." It appears from Hwen Thsang's Travels (Beal, Buddhist Records, I, p. 214) that Śīlāditya of Kanauj erected *punyaśālās* in all the high ways of the towns and villages of India; these were provided with food and drink, and physicians were stationed there with medicines for travellers and poor people of the localities.

According to the Vaidyaka Śāstras that praise the founding of hospitals as a monumental work of piety, the *ārogyasālā* is to be equipped with a good stock of important drugs (*mahaushadha-parichchhadā*), expert physicians (*vidagdha-vaidya-saṃyuktān*), and a good store of food and regimen *bahvannarasa-saṃyuktān*), and the physicians employed are to be well-versed in the science, wise and adept in diagnosis and choice and application of drugs, as well as in the prescription of proper diet. According to Suśruta, the surgical ward (*vraṇitā-gāra*) is to be equipped with medicine, necessary articles of diet, dissecting apparatus (*śāstras, anuśāstras*) including splints, aspirator to drain off blood, etc., and bandages, suture material, and surgical box.]



The *gilānasālā* mentioned in the Pali Nikāyas was a sick room or nursing hall in a Buddhist monastic establishment, equipped with *bhesajjas* (drugs and diet) and occasionally attended by local physicians who offered their free services. It was the internal arrangement of a monastic abode for the segregation of the diseased among its inmates; as such it was not open to the public. The Buddha himself praised the nursing of the sick (*gilānupaṭṭhānam*) on the part of a fellow mendicant, and spoke of the following five qualities of a capable attendant: (1) he is able to administer proper drugs and diet (*paṭibalo hoti bhesajjam samvidhātum*), (2) knows what is beneficial and what harmful (*sappāyāsappāyam jānāti*), (3) removes what is harmful (*asappāyam apanāmeti*), (4) has friendly heart and no unfriendly feeling to attend the patient without being loth to handle the excreta (*mettachitto gilānam upaṭṭhāti no āmisantaro, ajeguchchī hoti kheḷam vā nīharitum*), and (5) is able to encourage, cheer up, incite and inspire the patient with reasonable advice at the proper hour, from time to time (*paṭibalo hoti gilānam kālena kālam dhammiyā kathāya sandassetum*).

Kauṭilya recommends the allocation of *panya-bhaishajyagriham* ("shops and hospitals", Shamasastri) to the north west side of a fort or fortified city. The word *panya-bhaishajyagriham* must be taken to mean medical stores for the sale of drugs, drug shops. It does not convey the idea of hospitals. Aśoka's word *dānagaḥe* ("almshouses") in Queen's Edict is equally vague for the purpose. The *dānasālas* founded on four sides of a town by the king as well as the landed or rich aristocracy were in abundance. The question, however, remains still open—Did any of them represent hospitals with provisions of medicine, treatment, clinics and diet? We need a more positive evidence to be sure about the founding of hospitals by Aśoka.

Dr. Majumdar has not noticed that Kauṭilya, too, speaks of compartments provided with all kinds of medicine useful in midwifery and diseases (*garbhavyādhi-vaidyapraḥlyāta-saṁsthā*) attached to the harem, and of the store room of drug (*bhaishajyāgāra*) attached to the palace (Arthasāstra, I. 21, I. 22). The expert physicians were in the service of the king. But the arrangements do not suggest the idea of a hospital open to the public.

3. Add to notes 1 and 2 under R. E. VI: Here *vrachasi*=*rathavraje* (Amar-koṣha, Kshatriyavarga, 142), and *vinita*=*vinīta*, *ibid*, 113: *vinītaḥ sādhu-vāhinah*.

4. Add as note 4 under R. E. XIV:—*ghaṭitam*: "executed" (Mookerji), "suitable" (Hultzsch), "possible" (*ante*, p. 194). Mookerji's translation should be preferred to "suitable" and "possible", cf. Bodhicharyāvatāra, V. 7: *śāstrāṇi kena narake ghaṭitāni prayatnataḥ*. Here *ghaṭita* means 'made'. But it may also be translated by "attempted", cf. Pali *yuñjati ghaṭati vāyamati*, meaning "applies oneself to, makes effort, endeavours." *Ghaṭita* (a past participle of *ghaṭeti*) in the sense of "connected, combined" does not suit the Aśokan context.



## B. THE ALPHABETICAL TABLE OF WORDS & PHRASES EXPLAINED AND DISCUSSED IN THE GLOSSARY

amñe (amne)	.. 305	anusañyānam niyātu	.. 243
Am̐ta-mahāmātā	.. 346	apachiti	.. 310
am̐taram	.. 249	apabham̐datā	.. 247
am̐tā (pracham̐tā)	.. 229	aparadhiyā (apaladhiyenā, av-	
Am̐tikini	.. 322	aradhiyā)	.. 345
Am̐tiyoko (Am̐tiyoge)	.. 322	aparātā	.. 265
Am̐tiyoge (Am̐tiyoko)	.. 236	aparigodhāya	.. 256
amne aparātā	.. 265	apaladhiyenā	.. 345
Am̐tiyoge nāma yonalājā-ye		apavyayatā	.. 247
cha-amne tasā Am̐tiyogasā		apavyayatā apabham̐datā sādhu	247
sāmañtā lājāno	.. 236	✓ apāsinave	.. 347
amne tsa Am̐tiyogasā sāmañ-		apāsniave bahukayāne	.. 350
tā lājāno	.. 236	amisā	.. 338
amne nātike	.. 276	amisā samānā munisā Jambu-	
amne nikāyā	.. 314	dīpasi misā devehi	.. 338
amne va pāsam̐dā gihathā vā	.. 318	ayāya Sambodhim	.. 303
am̐bā-kapilikā	.. 357	Alikasudara	.. 322
agabhuti-susūsā	.. 318	alune	.. 355
agikham̐dhāni	.. 250	avadhiyāni kaṭāni	.. 359
aja (=adya)	.. 319	asamātām likhitām	.. 329
ajakā	.. 366	asti eta puna-puna-vutam	.. 329
ajakā nāni cākā chā sūkālī chā		asti eva samkhitena	.. 329
gabhinī va pāyaminā va		asti pi tu ekachā samājā sādhu-	
avadhiyā	.. 366	matā	.. 227
añāni divyāni rūpāni	.. 250	asti majhamena	.. 329
añāya pi kañmāya	.. 245	asti vistatena	.. 329
aṭaviyo	.. 319	Ājivikesu	.. 371
aṭhami-pakhāye	.. 372	Ājivikehi	.. 384
aḍhātiyāni vasāni	.. 334	ā-Tambapannī	230, 235
atapatiye me kaṭe	.. 349	āñapayāmi	.. 284
atikātām am̐taram	.. 249	ānapayisanti	.. 247
athasam̐tirañā	.. 297	ānapitam	.. 236
adhikāni aḍhātiyāni vasāni	.. 334	ā-pāna-dākhināye	.. 349
anaṭhikamachhe	.. 356	ārabhare	.. 342
anāthesu	.. 269	ārabhitpā	.. 224
anārambho	.. 246	ārabhisare	.. 342
anāvāsasi āvāsaiye	.. 382	ārādhayañtu	.. 298
anugahe kaṭe	.. 349	ārādhayitave	.. 342
anutape	.. 320	āvutī	.. 351
anutape cha pabhave cha	.. 320		
anu-Tisām	.. 332		
anubam̐dha, ānubam̐dhā	.. 272	itale magale	.. 312
anuposatham	.. 370	Ithidhiyakha-mahāmātā	.. 314



idam ānapitam ..	236	khādiyati ..	360
idha (hida) ..	223	khānāpitāni ..	238
idha nāni sukhāpayāmi etc. ..	298	khudakā ..	342
idha rājavisayamhi ..	327		
imasa kammasa me ..	331	gaṅgāpupūtake ..	358
imāni jātāni avadhiyāni kaṭāni ..	354	Garudhārānam ..	256
imāya dhammānusasīya ..	245	gananasī ..	247
iminā kālena ..	337	garūnam ..	310
iyam hi chu tato gulumatatale ..	318	gāumatatale ..	318
Isila ..	334	gāmakapote ..	360
		gihathā ..	316
uchāvacham maṅgalam ..	305	gulumate ..	319
udupānāni ..	238	gelāṭe ..	357
usāhena ..	346	ghaṭitā ..	387
uṣṭānam cha athasamtīranā chā ..	297	chakavāke ..	355
ekachā ..	329	chakudāne bahuvidhe dimne ..	349
elakā ..	366	chatupade ..	360
etake magale ..	312	-chatupadesu ..	349
etasa kammasa same ..	331	chātummāsi-pakhāye ..	373
etāya amṭalikāya ..	374	chātummāsiye ..	373
etāni yeva divasāni ..	371	chātummāsīsu ..	367
etāye athāye viyāpaṭā dhamma- mahāmātā etc. ..	314	chāvudasam paṇṇadasam paṭi- padāye ..	368
etāyeva athāya etc. ..	245	chikīsā ..	237
ete pi pachhā na ārabhisare ..	227	Choḍā ..	230
esā porānā pakiti dighāvuse cha ..	345	Choḍā Pāḍā Satiyaputo Ketala- puto ā Tambapaṇṇī ..	230
e hi itale magale ..	312		
		Jambudīpasi ..	338
okapiṇḍe ..	360	jatūkā ..	351
odātāni dusāni sanamdhāpayitu ..	381	jātāni ..	354
olodhanesu ..	275	jīvitāye tānam ..	351
		ñātinam ..	246
-Kamboja- ..	256	✓ Tambapaṇṇiya, Tambapaṇṇī ..	235
-Kambojesu ..	327		
kammasa ..	331	tatogulumatatale ..	318
kammāya ..	245	tato satabhāge cha sahasabhāge va aja gulumate ..	319
kaṭāni ..	344	tatra ekadā asamātam likhitam ..	329
kaṭe ..	349	tadopayā ..	305
katam ..	253	tasā Amṭiyogasā sāmāntā lājāno ..	236
katamnatā ..	300	tānam ..	351
katā ..	337	tāvatake ..	317
-kapilikā ..	357	tiṇṇi divasāni ..	368
kaphaṭasayake-seyake ..	359	Tisāyam puṇṇamāsiyam ..	367
kalāṇam ..	253	Tisāye Punāvasune ..	372
kāni ..	351	tisu chātummāsīsu ..	367
kārunakāni ..	345	tivre dhramavaye ..	318
Ketalputa ..	230, 235	-Tisam ..	322
Keralaputra ..	230, 235	Tisa-nakhatena ..	332
kevaṭabhogasi ..	372		
koṭavishavesu ..	383		
Khalatikasi pavatasi ..	384		



tī eva prānā ārabhare, etc pi		dhammānugaho	.. 311
pachhā na ārabhisare	.. 227	✓ dhammānusastīya	.. 245
Tulamaye	.. 322	dhuvāye cha anuposatham	.. 370
tenetā, tenesā dhammayātā	.. 303	dhramavaye	.. 318
		naṇḍimukhe	.. 356
daṇḍa-samatā viyohāla-saṇḥatā	.. 351	na kiṇchi jīvaṃ ārabhitpā	
daḍhabhatitā	.. 300	prajūhitavyaṃ	.. 224
dayā	.. 349	nāgavanasi kevaṭabhogasi	.. 372
-darsaṇā	.. 250	nātikā va kāni nijhapayisaṃti	
dasayitpā janaṃ	.. 250	jīvitāye tānaṃ	.. 351
dānaṃ	.. 246	nālike	.. 276
dāni	.. 341	nāsaṃtaṃ vā nijhāpayitā	.. 353
dāne	.. 349	nikāyā	.. 314
dāpakam	.. 284	nijhati	286, 377
dāpakam vā srāvapakam vā	.. 284	nijhapayisaṃti jīvitāye tānaṃ	.. 351
dāsabhatakamhi samyapratipati	306		
dīṇne	349, 351	pañchasu pañchasu vāsesu	.. 244
dinā Ajivikehi	.. 384	Paṇḍiya	.. 232
divyāni rūpāni	.. 250	pañnavīsati baṇḍhana-mokh-	
dīghāvuse	.. 345	āni kaṭāni	.. 374
duāhale	.. 331	pañnasase	.. 359
duāhale etasa kammasa same	.. 331	pakiti	.. 345
dupada-chatupadesu	.. 358	pakhi-vālichalesu	.. 349
duḍḍi (duḍḍi)	.. 358	pachhā	.. 227
dūtā	.. 327	potake pi cha kāni āsaṃmāsike	366
Devānaṃpiya	.. 219	posathāye yāti	.. 383
devchi	.. 336	pajā	.. 333
dosam	.. 228	paṭipādayema	.. 331
✓ dve chikīsā katā	.. 237	paṭibhogam no eti	.. 360
✓ dhammaghoso	.. 249	paṭividhānāye apalibodhāye	
dhammakāmatā	.. 314	mokhāye	.. 271
dhamma-thaṃbhāni	.. 376	pabhave	.. 320
dhamma-niyamāni	.. 377	paratrā cha svagam ārādhayaṃtu	299
dhamma-niyame	.. 377	paribhogāya pasumunisānaṃ	.. 238
dhamma-sāvanāni	.. 376	✓ parisāya	.. 292
dhamma-sāvanāni sāvāpitāni	.. 375	palasate	.. 360
dhammasāvane kaṭe	.. 375	✓ palisā (pulisā) pi gannaṇasi	
✓ dhammānusathini	.. 375	yutāni āṇapayisaṃti	.. 247
dhammāpadānathāye	.. 376	pasu-munisānaṃ	.. 238
✓ dhammadānaṃ	.. 311	Pāṭalipute	.. 274
✓ dhammadipi (dhammalipi)	.. 222	Pāṭalipute cha bāhirasu cha	
✓ dhammamamgale	.. 308	nagaresu	.. 274
✓ Dhammamahāmātā	253, 314	-pāna-dākhināye	.. 349
dhammayātā	.. 304	pāpe hi nāma supadālaye	.. 253
dhammayutasa	.. 256	pāratrikāya	.. 313
dhammayutānaṃ aparigodhāya	.. 256	pāsaṇḍā	299, 318
dhammayutāye apalibodhāye	.. 269	pāsaṇḍāni	.. 313
dhammavaḍhiyā	.. 256	-pāsaṇḍesu	.. 255
✓ dhammavijaya	.. 320	Piyadasi	.. 220
dhammavutaṃ anuvidhiyatāṃ	.. 313	putrā cha potrā cha prapotrā	
dhammādhithānāye	.. 256	cha ... āva savāṭa-kapā	.. 252



# ALPHABETICAL TABLE

( 391 )

puna-puna-vutaṃ	.. 329	munisā	333, 338
pūjayati	.. 315	-munisānaṃ	.. 238
-Petenikānaṃ	.. 261	mokhāye	.. 271
porāṇā pakitti	.. 345	moro	.. 226
posathāye yāti	.. 383		
prāṇānaṃ sādhu anārambho	.. 246	yaṃ kiṃchī mukhato āṇapay-	
prāṇārambho	.. 249	āmi svayaṃ	.. 284
		yathā añāya pi kaṃmāya	.. 245
baṇḍhanaṃtika	.. 330	yā aṭaviyo Devānaṃpiyasa vi-	
bambhanibhiyesu	.. 269	jite hoti	.. 319
bambhana-samaṇānaṃ dānaṃ	.. 246	Yutā	.. 239
bahukaṃ hi dosaṃ samājamhi		Yutāni	.. 247
pasati	.. 226	ye aṃne aparātā	.. 265
bahukayāne	.. 347	yena maṃ ālādhayitave	.. 350
bahu-kalāṇaṃ	.. 253	ye saṃghaṃ bhākatī bhikhu vā	
bahukāni dhāmma-niyamāni		bhikhuni vā	.. 381
yāni me kaṭani	.. 377	vote diṃne	.. 351
bahu-tāvatake mate	.. 317	Yona	256, 327
bahu-prāṇa-sata sahasrāni	.. 227	Yona Kaṃboja-Gaṃdhārānaṃ	.. 256
bahuvidhe diṃne	.. 349		
bahūni vāsa-satāni	.. 249	rājā sarvata ichhati save pāsam-	
Bābhanesu Ājivikesu	.. 371	dā vaseyu	.. 299
bāhiresu cha nāgaesu	.. 274	Ristika-Petenikānaṃ	.. 261
bhagininaṃ	.. 276		
bhaṭamāyesu bambhanibhiy-		lājāno	.. 236
esu etc.	.. 269	likhitā, likhāpitā	.. 222
bhayena	.. 345	lukhāni lopāpitāni	.. 238
bhātināṃ cha me bhagininaṃ		lekhitā, lekhāpitā	.. 222
cha ē vā pi aṃne nātike	.. 276		
bhāvasudhitā	.. 300	✓ Vachabhūmikā	.. 341
bhāge aṃne	.. 305	vachasi	281, 387
bhutānaṃ vihiṃsā	.. 249	vachiguti	.. 314
✓ bherighose aho dhammaghoso	.. 249	vaseyu	.. 299
		-vālichalesu	.. 349
magale	.. 312	vāsasatāni	.. 249
Magā	.. 322	vinītamhi	283, 387
magseu lukhāni lopāpitāni		vimāna-darsaṇā etc.	.. 250
udupānāni cha khānāpitāni	.. 238	viyaṃjanate	.. 247
mago	.. 228	viyohāla-samatā	.. 351
✓ majham paṭipādayema	.. 331	vivādo nijhatī vā	.. 286
majhamena	.. 329	vivāsāpayātha	.. 384
mayā idaṃ āṇapitaṃ	.. 238	vividhe anugahe kaṭe	.. 349
mayā bahu-kalāṇaṃ kataṃ	.. 253	vistatena	.. 329
mahātpā	.. 342	vihārayātā	.. 301
-mahāmātā	.. 314	vuḍhesu	.. 269
mahāmātā lājavachanikā	.. 332	vedaveyake	.. 358
mahāmātresu	.. 287	vyuthena	200, 50, 6, 343
mātari cha pitari cha susrūsā	.. 245	saṃkujamachhe	.. 359
mitra-saṃstuta-ñātināṃ dānaṃ	.. 246	saṃkhitena	.. 329
mitrena va suhodayena vā etc.	.. 311	saṃghaṃ upagate	.. 334
mukhato āṇapayāmi svayaṃ	.. 284	saṃḍake	.. 360



samghe samage kaṭe	.. 378	savesu olodhanesu	.. 275
✓ Sambodhi	.. 302	sahasaghāge	.. 319
samsalanasi	.. 383	sahāyena	.. 311
-samstuta—	.. 246	sādhu d(a)na iti	.. 310
sache	.. 349	sāmaṁtā lājāno	.. 236
satabhāge	.. 319	sāravadhī	.. 313
-sata sahasrāni	.. 227	sālikā	.. 355
Satiyaputa	230, 233	simale	.. 359
samachariyam	.. 320	sudivasāye	.. 372
✓ samāja	.. 224	suke	.. 355
samājā sādhumatā	.. 227	Suvarṇagiriti	.. 353
samājamhi	.. 226	suvihitā	.. 319
-samanānam	.. 246	suhadayena	.. 311
-samatā	.. 351	sūkalī	.. 366
✓ samavāya	.. 314	setakapote	.. 360
sayame	.. 300	sochaye	.. 349
sarvata	.. 233	srāvāpakam	.. 284
✓ sarvata vijite	228, 239		
savam pāratrikāya	.. 313	haṁsa	.. 356
savata-kapā	.. 252	hasti-darsanā	.. 250
✓ sava-pāsaṁdāni pūjayati	.. 313	hitasukhāye dhammayutasa	.. 256
sava-pāsaṁdesu	.. 275	hitasukhāye	.. 269
✓ sava-munisā me pajā	.. 333	hida (idha)	.. 229
save chatupade ye paṭibhogam	.. 360	hevam āha	.. 222
no eti na cha khādiyati			



# GENERAL INDEX

## AUTHORS

- Aaron, 363.  
 Aiyangar, S. K., 182, 234, 235, 249.  
 Āpastamba, 295, 339, 361, 362, 363, 369.  
 Arrian, 320.
- Banerji, Gauranga Nath, 324.  
 Barua, B. M. (and Sinha), 255, 303, 343.  
 Barua, D. L., 38.  
 Beal, Samuel, 385.  
 Beloch, 323.  
 Bhandarkar, D. R., 180, 184, 192, 195, 196, 199, 201, 206, 207, 208, 212, 215, 219, 220, 222, 226, 230, 231, 232, 234, 235, 237, 239, 243, 250, 257, 261, 262, 263, 266, 270, 275, 276, 278, 286, 291, 297, 302, 303, 305, 313, 315, 319, 325, 328, 330, 331, 332, 335, 337, 338, 339, 340, 342, 347, 348, 351, 353, 355, 367, 370, 372, 373, 376, 380, 383.  
 Bhandarkar, R. G., 234.  
 Bhāradvāja, 296.  
 Bhāsa, 278.  
 Bhattoji Dikshita, 219, 220.  
 Bodhāyana, 361, 366.  
 Bose, A. K., 243.  
 Bose, Atindra Nath, 307.  
 Buddhadatta, 231.  
 Buddhaghosa, 187, 196, 203, 208, 209, 221, 228, 231, 238, 239, 243, 244, 246, 259, 263, 264, 270, 283, 284, 286, 287, 288, 292, 302, 308, 310, 311, 314, 319, 320, 328, 329, 336, 345, 347, 350, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 372, 376.  
 Bühler, 179, 207, 213, 222, 233, 237, 242, 243, 266, 274, 286, 334, 346, 358, 360, 366, 367, 371, 373, 376, 384.  
 Bury, 326.
- Chakravorti, Manmohan, 208, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360.  
 Charaka, 363.  
 Chatterji, Charan Das, 192, 228, 243, 277, 337.  
 Coomaraswamy, A. K., 261.  
 Cunningham, 231.
- Dutt, N., 331.
- Fa Hien, 385.  
 Fausböll, 321, 356.  
 Fleet, 278.  
 Franke, 270.
- Gautama, 272, 361, 362, 366.  
 Gobhila, 367, 368, 369, 372.
- Haradatta, 361.  
 Hemchandra, 219, 358.  
 Hopkins, 226.  
 Hultzsch, 179, 184, 188, 191, 194, 195, 196, 197, 199, 201, 205, 206, 207, 213, 214, 215, 216, 221, 222, 231, 235, 240, 274, 275, 290, 291, 303, 305, 317, 318, 329, 330, 331, 333, 337, 346, 383, 384.  
 Hwen Tshang, 385.
- Iyengar, Srinibas, 268.
- Jayaswal, K. P., 181, 205, 220, 240, 243, 257, 260, 261, 262, 264, 266, 285, 286, 291, 292, 293, 294, 296, 297, 321.
- Kalhana, 279.  
 Kātyāyana, 219, 261.  
 Kauṭilya, 226, 243, 247, 260, 272, 273, 274, 277, 281, 283, 287, 289, 290, 291, 296, 299, 301, 306, 308, 309, 310, 317, 320, 321, 328, 329, 340, 346, 354, 355, 361, 365, 366, 371, 372, 373, 374, 384.



Kern, 206, 213, 222, 242, 243, 334, 351,  
380.  
Kirfel, 233.  
Kulluka, 360.

Law, Bimala Churn, 231, 232, 256,  
264.

Levi, Sylvan, 338.

Lüders, 195, 241, 288, 354.

Majumdar, G. P., 385, 386.

Majumdar, N. G., 226.

Manu, 272, 297, 307, 311, 319, 331,  
361, 362, 363, 364, 365.

Medhātithi, 297, 307.

Megasthenes, 232, 236, 365.

Michelson, 262.

Mitra, S. N., 181, 203, 206, 240, 242,  
247, 253, 331, 337, 350, 352.

Moggaliputta Tissa, 379, 380.

Mookerji, R. K., 179, 184, 189, 195,  
196, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211,  
212, 219, 220, 222, 226, 237, 239,  
243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 250, 251,  
269, 270, 272, 274, 276, 277, 279,  
280, 283, 284, 286, 287, 291, 299,  
303, 305, 308, 309, 313, 316, 318,  
319, 321, 325, 331, 332, 333, 335,  
336, 338, 339, 341, 343, 345, 346,  
351, 353, 355, 358, 366, 367, 370,  
371, 372, 374, 378, 381, 382, 383,  
384.

Morris, 209.

Moses, 363.

Ojha, 284.

Oldenberg, 380.

Pai, M. G., 233, 267.

Pāṇini, 224, 255, 257, 261, 367.

Parāśara, 296.

Patañjali, 219, 261, 384.

Pisuna, 296.

Ptolemy, 234.

Rāmachandran, T. N., 321.

Raychaudhuri, H. C., 219, 220, 226,  
229, 230, 232, 233, 235, 236, 240,  
241, 242, 243, 244, 249, 259, 261,  
264, 265, 267, 270, 288, 290, 302,  
315, 318, 320, 321, 322, 328.

Rhys Davids, T. W., 377.

Sahni, 200.

Sastri, Haraprasad, 338.

Sastri, T. Ganapati, 278.

Sastri, Vidhusekhara, 283.

Senart, 207, 222, 242, 257, 273, 283,  
334.

Shamasastri, 273, 281.

Smith, Vincent A., 181, 199, 206, 236,  
242, 243, 253, 256, 268, 323, 324,  
334, 343, 374, 376.

Suśruta, 363.

Tāranātha, 277, 279.

Thomas, F. W., 207, 226, 239, 240,  
242, 288, 338, 383, 384.

Vājasaneyas, 362, 369.

Varāhamihira, 232.

Vaśiṣṭha, 272, 361, 362, 366.

Vasumitra, 379.

Vātsāyana, 226, 291.

Viśālāksha, 296.

Vishṇu, 371, 372.

Woolner, 346.

Wordsworth, 204.

Yājñavalkya, 272.

### OTHER PERSONAL NAMES

Achyutavikrānta-vikrama, 231.

Agnibrahmā, 276, 279.

Ajātasatru (Ajātasattu), king, 284,  
288, 312, 315, 328, 380.

Ajita Kesakambala, 385.

Alexander, 192, 236, 261, 322, 326.

Alexander of Corinth, 323.

Alexander of Epirus, 323.

Alexander the Great, 323, 324.

Anaxarchus, 326.

Antialkidas, 325.

Antigonas (Anitikini), 192, 236, 322,  
325.

Antiochus, (Antiyoka), 180, 181, 192,  
236, 322, 323, 325.

Asandhimittā, 280.



Baladeva, 255.  
 Bhāgabhadra, Kāśiputra, 325.  
 Bhaṭṭiya, 277.  
 Brihadratha, king, 265.  
 Bhoja, king, 264.  
 Bimbisāra, 219, 278, 279, 288.  
 Bindusāra, 221, 276, 318, 323, 325.  
 Buddha, Kōnāgamana, 217, 303.  
 Buddha, Krakuchchanda, 267.  
 Buddha, Śākyamuni, 216, 303, 331.  
 Buddhadatta, 231.  
 Chandragupta, Maurya, 221, 226, 323.  
 Chapāda, 199, 334.  
 Dandamis, 326.  
 Darius, 222.  
 Daśaratha, 219, 384.  
 Deimachos, 325.  
 Democritus, 326.  
 Devī, Vaiśya wife of Aśoka, 280.  
 Dharmāsoka, 379.  
 Dionysos (Dionysios), 260, 325.  
 Eukratides, 231.  
 Hastin, king, 294.  
 Heliodoros, 298, 325.  
 Heracles, 232.  
 Hita (?), 201.  
 Jalauka, 279.  
 Janasāna, an Ājīvika, 384.  
 Kālāśoka, 379, 380.  
 Kāluvāki (Kāruvāki), 216, 275, 280.  
 Kaṇhā (Kṛishṇā), 232.  
 Kaṇha, Vāsudeva, 232.  
 Khāravēla, 225, 233, 264, 313.  
 Kumārapāla, 334.  
 Kuṇāla, 279.  
 Kūṇika (Ajātsatru), 219, 279.  
 Magas (Makā, Magā), 192, 236, 322, 323, 325.  
 Mahendra (Mahinda), 221, 279.  
 Makkhali Gosāla, 385.  
 Mañibhadra, 255.  
 Megasthenes, 325, 326.  
 Pakudha Kachchāyana, 385.

Pāṇdu, king, 232.  
 Pārśva, 365.  
 Plato, 326.  
 Porus, king of India, 326.  
 Prasenajit (Pasenadi), king, 283, 288, 297.  
 Priyadarśin, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 194, 203, 204, 205, 208, 211, 212, 213, 214, 216, 217, 220.  
 Ptolemy, 192, 231, 236, 322, 323, 325.  
 Pūrṇabhadra, 255.  
 Pūranakassapa, 385.  
 Pyrrho, of Elis, 326.  
 Rādhagupta, minister, 293, 295.  
 Rāhula, 203.  
 Rudradāman, 221, 295.  
 Samudragupta, 229, 322.  
 Saṅghamitrā, 276.  
 Saṅjaya Belatṭhaputta, 385.  
 Śātakarṇi, Gautamīputra, 278.  
 Sātavāhana, 241.  
 Seleukos Nikator, 322, 323, 326.  
 Subhadrāṅgī, 277.  
 Sumana (Susīma), 276, 277, 279.  
 Sunakshattra, Lichchhavi prince, 251, 252.  
 Sunīdha, 328.  
 Tissa (Tishya), 219, 277, 279, 315, 328.  
 Tivara, 216, 275, 280.  
 Udayabhadra, 274.  
 Udayana, Vatsa king, 278.  
 Upagupta, 303, 304.  
 Varshakāra, 328.  
 Vāsavadattā, 278.  
 Vāsudeva, 255, 256.  
 Vigatāśoka (Vītaśoka), 277, 315.  
 Virasena, son of Aśoka, 279.  
 Viśākhā, 315.  
 Viṣṇudāsa, 231.



## GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES

Aioi 234.  
 Alexandria, 260.  
 Andhra, 192, 266.  
 Aṅga, 278, 279.  
 Aparānta (Sunāparānta), 269.  
 Arachosia, 323.  
 Aria, 323.  
 Arkatos, 231.  
 Aryandom (Āryāvarta), 361, 365.  
 Āsmaka, 266.  
 Avantī, 266, 279, 280.  
 Barābar Hill Caves, 377.  
 Bhoja, 192.  
 Brahmagiri, 333.  
 Bodhgayā, 278.  
 Ceylon, 365.  
 Champā, 277.  
 Choḍa (Chola), 180, 192, 230-32, 266, 269.  
 Cholamaṇḍala, 231.  
 Chūrṇī, 235.  
 Cyrene, 323.  
 Dākshinātya, 265, 268.  
 Dakshināpatha, 258, 265.  
 Damilaraṭṭha, 231.  
 Daṇḍaka, 264, 265.  
 Daśārṇa, 265.  
 Egypt, 325.  
 Gāndhāra, 183, 256-7, 258, 259, 260, 261, 265, 269, 279, 332.  
 Ganges, 361.  
 Gayā, 303.  
 Gedrosia, 323.  
 Godāvarī, 258, 265, 266, 268.  
 Goparāshṭra, 266.  
 Gorathagiri, 384.  
 Hashtnagar, 261.  
 Herāt, 323.  
 Himalayas, 361.  
 Himavanta, 269.  
 Indraprastha, 232.  
 Indus, 260, 261.  
 Isila (Rishila), 269, 294, 334.  
 Isipatana, 305.

Jambudvīpa, 199, 201, 202, 229, 258, 338, 342.  
 Jaṭiṅga Rāmeswara, 333.  
 Kabul (Kubhā), R., 260.  
 Kabul, 323.  
 Kalinga, 191, 225, 265, 266, 320, 373.  
 Kāmboja, 183, 192, 256-7, 258, 259, 260, 265.  
 Kanakagiri, 333.  
 Kāñchīpura, 231, 233.  
 Kandahar, 323.  
 Kapilavastu, 267.  
 Karoura (Karur), 235.  
 Kāsmīra, 269, 279.  
 Kauśāmbī, 214, 243, 258, 275.  
 Kauśika, 265, 266.  
 Kāverī, R., 231.  
 Kāverīpattana, 231.  
 Keralaputra (Ketalaputra, Kerala), 180, 235, 266, 269, 274.  
 Kesaputta, 274.  
 Khalatika, 217, 384.  
 Kolapattana, 231.  
 Konganādu, 233.  
 Kosala, 242, 288, 328.  
 Krishṇā, 268, 269.  
 Krishṇabhenī, 265, 266.  
 Kṛitamālā, 233.  
 Kūla (Kūlya), 234, 235.  
 Kumbhavatī, 265.  
 Kūpaka, 235.  
 Kuru, 232.  
 Kusinārā, 305.  
 Laṅkā, 236.  
 Limyrike, 234, 235.  
 Lumbini-vana, 303.  
 Madhumanta, 265.  
 Madhyadeśa, 265, 268.  
 Madurā, 231.  
 Magadha, 258, 278, 287, 288, 328.  
 Mahārāshṭra, 266, 269.  
 Mahendra, Mt., 322.  
 Mahishaka, 265, 266.  
 Mahisharāshṭra (Mahishamaṇḍala), 269.  
 Mallarāshṭra, 266.



Mathurā, 264.  
Matsya, 265, 266.  
Mekala, 265.  
Middle Country, 365, 366, 367, 381.  
Mouziris (Muziris), 235.  
Mūshaka (Mūshika), 233, 235, 269.

Nābhaka, 192, 266, 267.  
Nābhapamkti, 192, 266, 267.  
Nāgārjuni Hill Caves, 377.  
Narmadā (Nerbudda), 265, 266.  
Nasik, 265.  
Nysa, 2660, 261.

Pandioni, 234.  
Pandokoi, 232.  
Pāṇḍurāshṭra, 266.  
Pāṇḍya (Pādā), 180, 192, 230, 231, 232-3, 266, 269.  
Pāṇḍya, Uttara, 232.  
Pārasamundra, 236.  
Pāriyātra Mountain, 361.  
Paropanisadai, 323.  
Pāṭaliputra, 184, 215, 223, 274, 281, 325, 380.  
Patiṭṭhāna, 258.  
Persia, 260.  
Prāchya, 265.  
Pratiṣṭhāna (Patiṭṭhāna), 266.  
Pravaragiri (Barābar), 384.  
Punch, 261.  
Puṇḍra, 266.  
Pūrvānta, 258.  
Pushkaravatī, 261.

Rājagriha (Rājagaha), 258, 278, 317, 380.  
Rājapura, 261.  
Rishṭika, 265, 266.

Sāketa, 284.  
Samāpā, 197, 243, 289, 293, 294.  
Satiyaputra (Sātiyaputa), 180, 233-5, 269, 274.  
Satyabhūmi, 233.  
Seriyāputra, 274.  
Siddāpura, 333.  
Sinhala (Sihala), 235.  
Sindhu-Sauvīra, 258.  
Soretai, 234.  
South India, 315.  
Srāvasti (Sāvatthi), 258, 284.  
Surāshṭra, 268.  
Sūrpāraka, 268.  
Suvarṇagiri, 199, 269, 278, 279, 294, 333.

Takshaṣilā, 197, 258, 261, 279.  
Tāmraparṇī, 180, 192, 233, 235-6.  
Tanjore, 232.  
Tosali, 195, 198, 279, 289, 294.  
Trichinnopoly, 232.  
Tuluva, 233.

Udīchya, 256, 265, 266, 268.  
Ujjayinī, 197, 279, 280.  
Uragapura (Orthoura), 231.  
Utkala, 265.  
Uttarakuru, 266.  
Uttarāpatha, 256, 258, 265.

Vaisāli (Vesāli), 243, 278, 328.  
Vanavāsī, 269.  
Vedisagiri, 274.  
Vidarbha (Vidabbha), 265, 266.  
Vidisā, 275, 280.  
Virāṭapura, 269.

Yamunā, 361.  
Yonarāshṭra, 269.

#### PEOPLES

Allied frontier peoples, 259.  
Andhras, 192, 264, 267, 269.  
Aṭavis (Forest-folk), 192, 229, 319.  
Āṭavyas (Āṭavikas), 265, 319.

Barbarians (Mlechchhajātayaḥ), 261.  
Bhojas, 192, 257, 262, 263, 265, 267.  
Bhojas (hereditary), 192.

Choḍas (Cholas), 180, 192, 234, 267, 269.  
Gāndhāras, 183, 254, 256, 257, 259, 260, 261, 265, 270.  
Kāmbojas, 183, 192, 254, 256, 257, 259, 260, 261, 265, 270.  
Keralaputras, 180, 230, 233, 235, 265.  
Keralas, 234.



Mahārāshtras, 265.  
Nābhakas, 192, 257, 266, 267, 269.  
Nabhakapamktis, 192, 257, 266, 267, 269.  
Pāṇdyas, 180, 192, 230, 232, 233, 234.  
Pāradas (Pārindas, Pātindas), 193, 264, 266, 267, 268, 269.  
Petenikas (Bhoja, Ristika-), 254, 257, 261, 262, 263, 264, 267.  
Rāshtrikas (Rishtikas), 183, 254, 257, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267.  
Rāshtrikas (hereditary), 183.

Satiyaputras, 180, 230, 233.  
Satiyas, 233.

Tāmraparṇivas, 180, 192, 230.

Western peoples (aparāntas), 184, 254, 256, 257, 258, 269.

Yaunas (Perso-Greeks, Persianised Ionians) 183, 192, 254, 256, 257, 259, 260, 265, 270, 327.

### RELIGIOUS SECTS

Ājivikas, 212, 217, 255, 336, 365, 376, 377, 384.  
All sects, 186, 211, 255.  
All sects of recluses and householders, 190, 212, 253, 255.  
Arjunakas, 255.

Bhikṣhus, 336, 380, 381.  
Bhikṣhunīs, 381.  
Brāhmaṇas, 181, 182, 186, 187, 189, 191, 192, 212, 214, 246, 253, 255, 259, 270, 271, 318, 326, 340, 376, 377.  
Brāhmīns and ascetics (who live by begging), 184, 254, 299.  
Buddhist Fraternity, (Saṃgha), 199, 203, 212, 214, 215, 245, 334, 335, 337, 378, 381.

Devadhārmikas, 255.

Ekadaṇḍins, 255.  
Ibhyas, 270, 271.

Mahāsālas, 255.

Nirgranthas (Jains), 213, 255, 336, 365, 376.

Other sects of householders, 191.

Pāṣaṇḍas, 299.  
Purohitas, 255.

Saṃghaṭas, 255.  
Śramaṇas, 181, 182, 186, 187, 189, 181, 182, 214, 246, 253, 259, 271, 299, 318, 326, 340.

Tāpasas, 255.  
Tridaṇḍins, 255.

Various other sects, 213.  
Vāsudevakas, 255.  
Vedic ascetics, 255.

Yājakas, 255.

### OFFICERS

Adhyakshas, 239, 242.  
Agronomoi, 241.  
Ājñādāpaka, 284.  
Akkhadassā, 287.  
Amātyas, 292.  
Antamahāmatras, 289, 346.  
Antapālas, 346.

Antarabhogikā, 287.  
Antarvaṃśika, 290.  
Antepura-upachārakā mahāmattā, 288, 290.  
Aṭavīpālas, 289.  
Āryaputra, 199.  
Āyuktas, 296.



# G. Index

( 399 )

- Brahmins, 200.  
 Chariot-trainers (*yūgyāchariyā*), 200.  
 Chora-rajjuka, 243.  
 Dāpaka, 185, 284.  
 Dārādhyakshas, 315.  
 Dharma-mahāmātras, 183, 184, 190, 212, 213, 253 f., 258.  
 Dharmasthas, 254.  
 Dhīsachivas, 287.  
 Dūtaka, 294.  
 Elephant-riders (*Hathiyārohā*), 200, 240.  
 Gaṇaka-mahāmatta, 288.  
 Gaṇikādhyaksha, 290.  
 Gāvādhyaksha, 290.  
 Gopas, 242.  
 Grāmakūṭa, 240.  
 Hathiyārohā, 240.  
 Hyparchs, 240.  
 Karmasachivas, 287.  
 Kārūnakas, 200, 240.  
 Kumāras, 244, 278.  
 Lājavahanikas, 242f., 244f., 289.  
 Lekhakas, 240.  
 Māgadha-mahāmatta, 288.  
 Mahābalādhikṛit, 294.  
 Mahābhojas, 264.  
 Mahāmṛta-nagalaka, 242.  
 Mahāmātra, 214, 215.  
 Mahāmātras, 185, 199, 213, 216, 240, 242f., 244, 264, 281, 286, 287, 289, 295.  
 Mahārāshṭrikas, 264.  
 Mahārāṭhis, 264.  
 Mahāsāndhivagrāhika, 294.  
 Mahāsenāpatis, 264.  
 Maṇḍalikā, 287.  
 Mantri-mahāmātras, 288f., 294.  
 Mantrins, 287.  
 Matī-sachivas, 287.  
 Meridarchs, 242.  
 Nagala-viyohālakā, 242, 289.  
 Nāgarika-mahāmātras, 287.  
 Nivigrāhakas, 240.  
 Orodha-mahāmatta, 290, 315.  
 Prādeśikas, 181, 240, 241f., 244.  
 Prādeśikeśvara, 242.  
 Pradeshtṛis, 242, 254.  
 Prativedakas, 291f.  
 Purushas, 181 (?), 206, 239, 241, 247f.  
 Rājapurushas, 249.  
 Rājāyuttas, 279.  
 Rajjuggāhaka amachcha, 241f.  
 Rajjuka, 181, 200, 241f.  
 Rajjukas, 206, 207, 240, 244, 254, 264, 286.  
 Rāshṭrapati, 240.  
 Rāshṭrikas, 200.  
 Rāshṭriyas, 264.  
 Rūpadarsakas, 240.  
 Sabbatthaka-mahāmatta, 288.  
 Sachivas, 292.  
 Samāhatṛi, 242.  
 Sāṅkhyakas, 240.  
 Scribe, 199.  
 Senānāyaka mahāmatta, 288.  
 Śrāvāpaka, 185.  
 Styadhyakshas, 281, 290, 315.  
 Stryadhyaksha-mahāmātras, 281, 290.  
 Sthānikas, 242.  
 Superintendents of women, 190.  
 Upayuktas, 239f.  
 Uttarādhyakshas, 239f.  
 Viceroys, 244f.  
 Viniyuktas, 239.  
 Vinichchhaya-mahāmatta, 288.  
 Vohārika-mahāmatta, 288.  
 Vrachabhūmikas, 190, 289, 281, 316f.  
 Wardens of the Marches, 204.  
 Yuktas, 181, 239f., 248f.